Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-250
Friday
28 December 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-250 *28 December 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: As of 2 January 1991, television sourcelines in the DAILY REPORT will reflect how a station identifies itself. In most cases, this change eliminates the "Television Service" designation in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new television sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Shevardnadze Interviewed Before Resignation *[Paris LE FIGARO 22-23 Dec]* 1
Observer Discusses Value of Strategic Arms Treaty *[TASS]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Churkin Delivers 27 Dec Foreign Ministry Briefing 3
Discusses Gulf Security Issues *[TASS]* 3
Sees 'Little Hope' in El Salvador *[TASS]* 3
Views Situation in Afganistan *[TASS]* 3
Comments on Nakayama Visit *[TASS]* 4
TASS Views UN General Assembly Session 4
Afro-Asian Committee Urges More UN Activity *[TASS]* 5
AAPSO Head Meets Soviet Officials *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States and Canada

1990 'Watershed' Year in Relations With U.S. *[TASS]* 6
Germ Warfare Vaccines for U.S. Gulf Troops *[TASS]* 6

Northeast Asia

Japan's Military Defense Budget Criticized *[TASS]* 6
Soviet Media Restrictions in Pyongyang Viewed *[Moscow International]* 7

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Paris Talks on Cambodia Called 'Step Forward' *[Moscow International]* 8

Near East & South Asia

Belousov, Saddam Husayn Hold Talks in Baghdad *[TASS]* 8
Foreign Ministry: 250 Return From Iraq *[TASS]* 9
New Israeli Consul General Interviewed on Ties *[TASS]* 9
Shevardnadze Cited on Ties *[THE JERUSALEM POST 27 Dec]* 9
Kuwaiti Ambassador Says Loan Not 'Compensation' *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 10
Saddam's Foreign Policy Views Termed 'Obsolete' *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 10
Commentary Criticizes Refusal of Iraqi Food Aid *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 11

East Europe

Relations With Albania, Reforms Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 19 Dec]* 11

West Europe

CPSU's Semenova Interviewed on PCF Congress *[PRAVDA 23 Dec]* 13
Gremitskikh Views Presence in Germany, Aid *[Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG 22-23 Dec]* 14

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaraguan Military Budget Reduction Viewed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 15

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of USSR People's Deputies

Yanayev Elected Vice President on Second Ballot 16
Results 'Officially Announced' *[TASS]* 16
Deputies Voice Support for Yanayev *[TASS]* 16
Yanayev Gives News Conference on Election *[TASS]* 16
'Highlights' Reported *[Moscow International]* 17
Expresses Support for Perestroyka *[Vienna TV]* 17
Comments on Gorbachev Japan Visit *[Tokyo KYODO]* 17
Congress Closing Day Proceedings Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 18
Gorbachev Comments on RSFSR Budget *[Moscow TV]* 24
Gorbachev Makes Closing Statement, Urges Unity *[Moscow TV]* 27
Finance Minister Pavlov on Budget Problems *[Moscow Radio]* 28
Budget Chief Speaks in 'Sharp Debate' *[Moscow TV]* 29
Congress Issues Appeal to 'Peoples of the Country' *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Deputies Congress Adopts Bill on Referendum *[TASS]* 30
Congress Decision on Gulf Situation Reviewed *[TASS]* 31
Congress Confirms Procurator, Court Appointments *[TASS]* 31
Congress Elects New Supreme Soviet Deputies *[TASS]* 31
TASS Reviews Congress' Final Day 32
PRAVDA Reports Deputies' 26 Dec News Conference *[27 Dec]* 32
PRAVDA Publishes Constitutional Amendments Law *[PRAVDA 27 Dec]* 33
Amendments Enabling Law Published *[PRAVDA 27 Dec]* 36
Kalmykov Interviewed on Referendum Law *[PRAVDA 27 Dec]* 37
Deputy on Call for Debate on Troops in Gulf *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Dec]* 38

Political & Social

Deputies React to Shevardnadze Resignation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Dec]* 39
Deputy Gdlyan: Others To Follow *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Possible Successors *[TASS]* 40
TASS Observer on Yanayev as Vice President *[TASS]* 41
Afanasyev Warns Against Dictatorship *[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 21 Dec]* 41
Ryzhkov's Wife Interviewed *[TASS]* 43
Army Chief Discourages Using Reserves *[TASS]* 44
Self-Determination Rights Undermine Union *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Dec]* 44
Shebarshin Interviewed on KGB Anniversary *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 45
Moldovan Union Treaty Rejection Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Dec]* 47
Militia's 'Spetsnaz' Force Discussed *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 48
Response to OGONEK Criticism of Medvedev *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 50
Sobchak Views Presidential Structures *[SOYUZ No 49]* 52
Sovereignty Overrules 'Common Sense' *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 20 Dec]* 53
Higher Prices Threaten Paper's Survival *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 57
Sunday Press Delivery Suspension Discussed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 58
Rumors of Fire at Leningrad AES Refuted *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 21 Dec]* 60

Economic

Silayev-Textile Worker Talks Ease Tension *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 12 Dec]* 60
Urals Establishment Switches To Making Computers *[Moscow TV]* 60

Defense Industry Conversion Goods Exhibited *[Moscow TV]* 61
International Investment Bank Protocol Signed *[TASS]* 61

Scientific

Cosmos 2120 Satellite Launched 26 Dec *[TASS]* 61
Raduga-1 Communications Satellite Launched *[TASS]* 62

Military

Nuclear Test Resumption in Kazakhstan Denied *[Moscow International]* 62
Moiseyev Comments on New Military Service Law *[Moscow TV]* 62
Internal Troops' Komsomol Congress Starts *[Moscow Radio]* 62
PRAVDA Roundtable Views Defense Conversion *[Moscow PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 63

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic National Equality Resolution Published *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 5 Dec]* 67
Baltics Issue Appeal on USSR Troop Presence *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 5 Dec]* 67
Baltics Appeal to USSR People's Deputies *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 5 Dec]* 67
Deputies Call Appeal 'Political Provocation' *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 5 Dec]* 68
Baltic Information Bureau Opens in Denmark *[TASS]* 68
Four More Explosions Reported in Riga 69
Damage Several Buildings *[TASS]* 69
Minister Discusses Investigation *[Moscow TV]* 69
Latvia's Rubiks on Need for Union Treaty *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 20 Dec]* 69
Landsbergis Calls Western Attention to Baltics *[Hamburg DIE WELT 24 Dec]* 70
Landsbergis Addresses Vilnius Sajudis Meeting *[Vilnius Radio]* 71
Prunskiene Urges Economic Ties With Australia *[TASS]* 71
Incident at Nuclear Plant Termed 'Insignificant' *[Vilnius International]* 71
Lithuanian Procurator on Customs Post Incident *[Vilnius Interntional]* 72
Lithuania Passes Law on Direct Rule *[Vilnius International]* 73
Estonian-Russian Political Conflict Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 14 Dec]* 73

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Continues Meetings 76
Approves Budget Bill *[TASS]* 76
Declares Christmas Holiday *[TASS]* 76
Finance Minister Resigns *[Moscow International]* 76
Legislature Ends Session *[TASS]* 76
North Ossetia Adopts Sovereignty Declaration *[TASS]* 77
RSFSR Deputies Congress Outcome Viewed *[PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 77
Irkutsk Oblast Party Delegates 'Dissatisfied' *[PRAVDA 24 Dec]* 79
Orel Oblast Holds Party Conference *[PRAVDA 24 Dec]* 79
Bashkiriya Supreme Soviet Debates 91 Budget *[Moscow TV]* 79
Kuybyshev Deputies Restore Name to Samara *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 80
Chelyabinsk To Hold Nuclear Power Referendum *[PRAVDA 24 Dec]* 80
Kaliningrad To Open to Foreigners From 1 Jan *[Moscow Radio]* 80
Russian Farmers To Train in Panama *[TASS]* 80
Leningrad Experts Advise Against Finland Dam *[Moscow Radio]* 81

Western Republics

Belorussian KGB Head Refutes Sabotage Claim *[TASS]* 81
Moldovan Deputies Support Presidential Decree *[TASS]* 81
Statement Criticizes Grand National Assembly *[TASS]* 81
Journalists Deplore Moldova Media Treatment *[IZVESTIYA 22 Dec]* 82
Comparison to Presidential Decree on Moldova 83
Odessa Holds Referendum on Free Economic Zone *[IZVESTIYA 24 Dec]* 83

Caucasus

Yazov Protests Armenian Conscript Decision *[Moscow Radio]* 83
Armenian Presidium Discusses Parties' Property *[Yerevan Radio]* 83
Armenian Party Central Committee Holds Plenum *[PRAVDA 23 Dec]* 84
Armenian Free Trade Union Chairman Interviewed *[Yerevan Radio]* 84
Armenian Enlightenment Minister Views Education *[Yerevan Radio]* 84
Autonomous Formations Council Supports NKAO *[ARMENPRES]* 85
Azerbaijan Releases Statement on NKAO *[Baku Radio]* 85
Draft Proceeding 'Normally' in Azerbaijan *[TASS]* 86
Gorbachev Envoy Comments on South Ossetia *[TASS]* 86
Gamsakhurdia Rejects North Ossetia Protest *[TASS]* 86
Georgian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session 86
TASS Views New Leadership 86
Political Forces Not Consolidated *[TASS]* 87
Works on 1991 Budget *[Moscow TV]* 87

Central Asia

Kazakh Relations With DPRK, ROK Examined *[Moscow International]* 87
Kirghiz President Dismisses Osh Oblast Chairman *[IZVESTIYA 22 Dec]* 88

Shevardnadze Interviewed Before Resignation

PM2812093490 Paris LE FIGARO in French 22-23 Dec 90 p 4

[Interview with then Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Pierre Lelouche in Moscow; date not given: "Eduard Shevardnadze: 'Our Problem And Yours Is How To Make Perestroyka Succeed...'"]

[Text] [Lelouche] In Paris you signed the treaty on reducing conventional forces in Europe. In your opinion, what are the prospects for disarmament and for East-West relations following the Paris summit?

[Shevardnadze] We are living in a unique period in the history of mankind, and I personally am pleased to be involved in it. The former blocs are now talking about friendship and peace. We have reached a major agreement on Euromissiles, a treaty on the reduction of conventional forces, and we will be signing with the Americans a START treaty on the reduction of strategic weapons.

However, all this is just a beginning. We must make the process irreversible: It is quite apparent in the Gulf crisis that confrontation and the arms race continue, especially in the Near East. It is therefore essential to "globalize" the disarmament effort throughout the entire planet. To this end we believe—and this is our chief priority—that the nuclear disarmament plan put forward by the Soviet Union in 1986 retains its full validity: We must eliminate all nuclear weapons by the year 2000, starting with a global agreement banning all nuclear tests. We were recently forced to resume our nuclear tests, and we have seen how much our neighboring countries, but also our fellow countrymen, want to end this threat to the whole planet's ecology.

Our second priority is to reach a global agreement in the next two years to ban chemical weapons. Our third priority is to establish, within the UN context, a system to control weapons sales, starting by drawing up a system to monitor all weapons supplies throughout the world. Limiting weapons sales and disarming also entails converting weapons industries to civilian purposes: We have started disarming in the USSR, but we are encountering very difficult problems in the conversion field, which has added to the economic difficulties in our country.

[Lelouche] You talk about disarmament, but how do you explain the fact that your country withdrew behind the Urals, before the conclusion of the Paris Treaty, half the heavy equipment (70,000 of the 140,000 pieces of heavy equipment) deployed in central Europe? This equipment therefore escaped the treaty. Is it not a violation of the spirit, of not the letter, of the treaty? If so, how can we trust the USSR?

[Shevardnadze] Technically, first, the treaty does not forbid the redeployment of forces: It simply limits the level of armaments of both alliances in the area from the Atlantic to the Urals. So I will explain to you why we made the withdrawals: The explanation is that we are dealing with vast quantities of armaments. We decided to withdraw from East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. This represents hundreds of thousands of men and over 100,000 pieces of heavy military equipment—tanks, guns, armored vehicles, and aircraft. Where would you have wanted us to put them?

We began a process of unilateral withdrawal two years ago. At that time we did not know what we would do with all this equipment. Eventually we thought of storing some of it in the European part of the USSR and some of it in the Asiatic regions. We have inherited the legacy of a country in which militarization reached extraordinary levels. Eliminating all these weapons and converting our military industries is a huge task. You want to help us? Buy some of it!

The problem is even worse when it comes to destroying chemical weapons. In the face of the people's protests, we had to close down the plant that we had just constructed for this purpose at Tchipayenska [as published]. In other words, it is easier to build weapons than to destroy them. We have no other choice than to bring these forces back home. There is no subterfuge or manipulation in this. Nor do we want to threaten our Asian neighbors: On the contrary, we are seeking a similar agreement with our Chinese neighbors.

Last, we provided a detailed explanation of all this to our American, French, and British partners. They are by now convinced of our good faith. (Footnote) (I received confirmation from the Foreign Ministry that the USSR provided a written explanation of its withdrawals following a verbal and written protest from Washington, London, and Paris. The Ministry says that it is not satisfied with the Soviet explanations. Discussions on this point are continuing in Vienna within the context of the scheduled consultations on the implementation of the Paris Treaty. In Moscow it is believed that Shevardnadze allowed himself to be "overtaken" by the military, which decided itself in January to withdraw the equipment. Hence the embarrassed explanations of Shevardnadze and his colleagues.)

[Lelouche] What do you believe will be the outcome of the Gulf crisis?

[Shevardnadze] Of course it is the most pressing problem that we have to deal with. It is a good thing that the UN Security Council is taking charge of the whole business. I believe that the council's latest resolution has brought us nearer to a peaceful solution. We are all agreed on the principles: Aggression must not pay; the aggressor must withdraw from Kuwait. In my opinion, a peaceful solution is still possible. Any war in this area would be a disaster for Iraq and the Iraqi people. I hope that this fact will enter the Iraqis' heads. In practice, I believe that the resolution just approved by the Security Council does not automatically commit us to a war if a solution has not been found by 15 January.

[Lelouche] What do you consider the greatest problem that you have to resolve, both domestically and internationally?

[Shevardnadze] This will not surprise you: The greatest problem for us is above all how to make perestroyka succeed. This is the key problem for the USSR, but so it is also for all our friends and partners.

In terms of speed and extent and the changes already achieved, we have already beaten all world records! But we have no other choice than to continue, to pursue this approach to its logical conclusion.

Observer Discusses Value of Strategic Arms Treaty

LD2712220990 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS military observer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—Soviet-American talks on strategic offensive weapons have been held since 1985 and are now nearing completion. It is possible that the first strategic arms reduction treaty will be ready in time for the new Soviet-American summit.

It is already possible to assess this document, the first strategic agreement in the period of restructuring international relations. It should be stressed right from the start that Soviet and American experts are far from uniform in their attitude to the treaty. Some say that talks cannot ensure radical changes in the nuclear arsenals of the countries and hence fail to accomplish tasks set for them.

Of course, agreement reached so far is not optimal, in so far as not all planned objectives have been reached. The arms levels the treaty permits are still fairly high and do not eliminate the threat of a nuclear war completely.

Nevertheless, the prospective treaty will be a landmark on the road towards nuclear disarmament. Whereas the previous agreements in this field mainly restricted strategic offensive weapons, the new one intends to radically and effectively reduce them. In combination with the intermediate nuclear force treaty, the implementation of which has entered its final phase, the new treaty will become a factor reducing the nuclear threat.

It is also of extreme importance that although the treaty of the strategic arms reduction will not cut the Soviet and American nuclear potentials radically enough, it introduces limits and restricts the possibility of uncontrolled quantitative build-up of strategic arms and makes interrelations of the sides in the strategic field more predictable.

The treaty ensures a balance of interests: Neither side will get decisive advantages which could become the source of destabilisation in the field of strategic offensive weapons.

Imposing strict limits on nuclear arsenals and subjecting them to close mutual supervision, the treaty becomes a major stabilising factor, impossible to overestimate. The interests of the United States and the Soviet Union undoubtedly coincide in the desire to strengthen strategic stability.

Another important point should be stressed. Both sides are active members of the treaty of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and, under this treaty, are obliged to strive for effective measures to end the nuclear arms race.

The conclusion of the strategic arms reduction treaty would mark a step towards the fulfillment of these obligations. The success in reducing both Soviet and American strategic offensive weapons is of extreme importance for the effective restriction of the nuclear weapon proliferation.

Only by setting an example for others to follow, the Soviet Union and the United States can strengthen their confidence in the nuclear disarmament process and persuade others to abstain from acquiring nuclear weapons.

Churkin Delivers 27 Dec Foreign Ministry Briefing

Discusses Gulf Security Issues

LD2712174690 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The Soviet Union supports the appeal for the restoration of peace and security in the Gulf region, issued in Doha during the 11th conference of the cooperation council for the Arab states of the Gulf, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said at a briefing here today.

Leaders of six countries—Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman and the United Arab Emirates—discussed problems facing this regional organisation, primarily the crisis created by the Iraqi invasion of Kuwiat. They emphatically reiterated their demands for the unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and return to the situation that existed before the invasion.

Churkin said the Arab states of the Gulf preferred a peaceful settlement of the crisis, but are ready, in principle, to resort to extreme measures. It totally depends on the Iraqi leadership if they go that far, the Soviet spokesman said.

Churkin noted that participants in the conference did not confine discussion to current problems. They analysed issues dealing with the future of the region, specifically, ways of preventing situations similar to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwiat. Churkin said this looking to the future "deserves credibility." He said that the Soviet Union is ready "to participate effectively" in the creation of a reliable security sytem in the Gulf region.

Sees 'Little Hope' in El Salvador

LD2712163290 Moscow TASS in English 1604 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—"The developments in El Salvador give little hope for normalisation of the situation in that country in the near future," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

He pointed to the continued hostilities between government troops and rebels.

"We believe that it is very important in this situation to increase international efforts to promote dialogue between representatives of the government and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front, to achieve understanding, stop the bloodshed and provide conditions for the country's peaceful development," the spokesman said.

"It is necesary to note that a renewed campaign in the U.S., including Congress, to resume full military aid to the Salvadoran regime, is not conducive to the success of such a dialogue.

"A reason given in this campaign that insurgents have stepped up their combat operations is not convincing.

"On the contrary, the resumption of this aid plays into the hands of those forces in the Salvadoran Government and Armed Forces who still hope for an armed solution of the country's problems."

The spokesman rejected Soviet complicity in secret arms supplies to Salvadoran rebels. "As for reports in the American mass media that the front's units are armed with Soviet SA-14 missiles, Washington is well aware that the USSR has never supplied its weapons to Salvadoran rebels.

"On the other hand, we have no reason to challenge assurances by the front's leadership that neither Cuba nor Nicaragua are the sources of such weapons," Churkin stressed.

"Incidentally, it is a fact that rebels are also armed with U.S.-made Red Eye missiles, which was also confirmed by representatives of the Salvadoran Government," the spokesman said.

Churkin expressed hope that a lasting peace would be established in El Salvador and all Central America in 1991.

Views Situation in Afganistan

LD2712214390 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The military-political situation in Afghanistan has undergone no major changes in the last weeks of 1990, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

He said his decision to speak about that country was prompted by "a bitter anniversary for the Soviet Union and its people." December 27 marks the 11th anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Soviet spokesman named specific data characterising the activity of government and rebel troops in Afghanistan now. "On the whole," he said, "no vigorous combat activity by rebels has been reported lately."

He denied Western press reports that Kabul airport was closed because of rebel fire. "The airport is closed

following an extremely copious snowfall," Churkin said. He noted that rebels have reduced the intensity of fire near Kabul lately.

"The Afghan Government is already thinking about healing war wounds," Churkin stressed. "This refers to the establishment of the national commission for locating and defusing land-mines and other objects of danger to the population, both on government and rebel-controlled territories."

This refers also to the recent measures taken by the state to help war invalids, Churkin pointed out. He said that a cooperative agreement had been signed in Kabul recently between Soviet medical establishments and the Afghan side to improve treatment and prosthesis-making. A national association of invalids and disabled people has been set up to help all victims of the Afghan war. A special centre will be built to treat war invalids or make prosthesis for them. The Soviet side will take an active part in the project.

Comments on Nakayama Visit

LD2712165890 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Oleg Polovko]

[Excerpt] Moscow December 27 TASS—The exact date for the Japanese foreign minister's [Nakayama] visit to the Soviet Union will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels, a Soviet Foreign Ministry said [as received] today.

The visit, designed to prepare for the Soviet-Japanese summit was initially scheduled for the middle of December, but was then postponed to the first fortnight of January.

Both dates were inconvenient for both sides, spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said. [passage omitted]

TASS Views UN General Assembly Session

LD2112102390 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 21 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] New York December 21 TASS—The main part of the 45th session of the United Nations General Assembly is to end here today.

The current jubilee session is taking place at a crucial stage of mankind's history. Unprecedented prospects were opened up before the United Nations by the end of the "cold war", the replacement of rivalry by partnership and recognition of the supremacy of law.

The world community's reaction to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait has shown that the United Nations is unanimously opposed to any violations of civilized standards. The work of the session substantially helped turn the United Nations into the main centre for promoting the new world order.

The October 3 event in Europe was most symbolic: Two German states, both members of the United Nations, united on that day to form a single Germany.

The session focused on vital problems of disarmament and security, including measures to curb the arms race and nuclear disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and efforts to outlaw chemical weapons, defensive doctrines, confidence-building measures and openness. The General Assembly hailed the notable successes achieved in the course of Soviet-American negotiations on various problems of disarmament. It approved of the fact that the agreement on middle and shorter-range missiles is being implemented. The assembly also welcomed the possible conclusion soon of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons.

Furthermore, the session called for universal cooperation in the effort to resolve problems linked with ecology, the production and dissemination of narcotics, international terrorism, and also economic development and debts. On the whole, there were no signs of confrontation during the session. The delegations were eager to make constructive decisions, and an increasing number of resolutions was adopted by consensus—half of the resolutions on disarmament and security, decisions on Afghanistan and Cambodia, and most of the resolutions on human rights. The session stressed the vital need to call an international peace conference on the Middle East and called for the settlement of other regional conflicts.

The Soviet memorandum, entitled "The United Nations in the Post- Confrontational World", contains a proposal to draw up a comprehensive strategy for global partnership in the 1990's and in the opening period of the next century. The document was circulated during the session. The strategy it outlines must be based on a balance of interests and freedom of option, political realism, and unfailing observance of the United Nations Charter. The Soviet proposals were favourably received by the session. They helped to promote a fruitful and multi-lateral dialogue on the United Nations place and role in the future.

Summing up the results of work by the main part of the 45th session, its chairman Guido Demarco of Malta stressed that the United Nations General Assembly should work differently in the new international conditions. It must play a new role and react more promptly to the callings of the times. He moved to extend the time limits of the session and to hold its separate meetings not only in autumn, but also in spring and summer.

Afro-Asian Committee Urges More UN Activity

LD2412195390 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 24 Dec 90

[TExt] Moscow December 24 TASS—The end of the cold war has not yet led to the building of a non-violent world or a new world economic order. Relapses of power politics still manifest themselves in various regions of Asia and Africa, says a statement issued by the presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee. The statement was adopted at the committee's just ended plenary meeting here.

The committee plenum reaffirmed solidarity with the victims of any aggression and position-of-strength policy and expressed firm commitment to the principles of new thinking and the solution of all conflicts by peaceful political means.

Participants in the plenum supported the international community's efforts towards a peaceful settlement of problems and urged the United Nations to intensify work to resolve existing regional conflicts and avert new ones.

"In the present-day interconnected world, small-scale wars are fraught with a great threat. The clouds of war over the Gulf, where the consequenses of the Israeli aggression in the Middle East have not yet been eliminated, pose a threat on a global scale," the statement says.

The plenum recognised it to be the main line of the committee's activities to work to promote the establishment of negotiating mechanisms for the development of peace processes throughout Afro-Asian space in the interests of strengthening friendship and cooperation in relations between countries and peoples.

"Making our contribution to the building of all-European security and East-West confidence, we may not slacken solidarity with the peoples of Asia and Africa struggling against oppression, militarism and totalitarianism," the statement stresses.

"We may not betray the idea and spirit of Afro-Asian solidarity if only because we ourselves feel support and solidarity from other peoples at this time of difficulty for our perestroyka," the statement says.

AAPSO Head Meets Soviet Officials

LD2412204290 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 24 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow December 24 TASS—Mourad Ghaleb, president of the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO), has stayed in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

The guest was received by Yevgeny Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, and Aleksandr Dzasokhov, chairman of the Soviet parliament's Committee for International Affairs.

Ghaled also met Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and had meetings in the Institute of Oriental Studies and the Institute of African Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and in the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Peoples of Latin American.

The AAPSO president attended a plenary session of the presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

Afro-Asian Committee Urges More UN Activity

LD2412195390 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 24 Dec 90

[TExt] Moscow December 24 TASS—The end of the cold war has not yet led to the building of a non-violent world or a new world economic order. Relapses of power politics still manifest themselves in various regions of Asia and Africa, says a statement issued by the presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee. The statement was adopted at the committee's just ended plenary meeting here.

The committee plenum reaffirmed solidarity with the victims of any aggression and position-of-strength policy and expressed firm commitment to the principles of new thinking and the solution of all conflicts by peaceful political means.

Participants in the plenum supported the international community's efforts towards a peaceful settlement of problems and urged the United Nations to intensify work to resolve existing regional conflicts and avert new ones.

"In the present-day interconnected world, small-scale wars are fraught with a great threat. The clouds of war over the Gulf, where the consequenses of the Israeli aggression in the Middle East have not yet been eliminated, pose a threat on a global scale," the statement says.

The plenum recognised it to be the main line of the committee's activities to work to promote the establishment of negotiating mechanisms for the development of peace processes throughout Afro-Asian space in the interests of strengthening friendship and cooperation in relations between countries and peoples.

"Making our contribution to the building of all-European security and East-West confidence, we may not slacken solidarity with the peoples of Asia and Africa struggling against oppression, militarism and totalitarianism," the statement stresses.

"We may not betray the idea and spirit of Afro-Asian solidarity if only because we ourselves feel support and solidarity from other peoples at this time of difficulty for our perestroyka," the statement says.

AAPSO Head Meets Soviet Officials

LD2412204290 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 24 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow December 24 TASS—Mourad Ghaleb, president of the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO), has stayed in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

The guest was received by Yevgeny Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, and Aleksandr Dzasokhov, chairman of the Soviet parliament's Committee for International Affairs.

Ghaled also met Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and had meetings in the Institute of Oriental Studies and the Institute of African Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and in the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Peoples of Latin American.

The AAPSO president attended a plenary session of the presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

also bringing the announced strength of the ground forces of 180,000 people in line with their actual strength, just over 150,000 men. At the same time, the Armed Forces will receive some AWACS [Airborne Warning and Control System] radar detection and guidance airplanes, and missile salvo fire systems [sistemy zalpovogo raketnogo ognya]. The naval forces and the Air Force will be significantly strengthened.

The present transformation of military preparations in Japan is a direct consequence of the end of the cold war era and positive changes in the international situation under the influence of new political thinking, which has at last reached this part of the Asia-Pacific region. The document "The Main Point of View Relating to Defense Plans for the Period From 1991," prepared by the government, together with stressing "the need for continuing efforts to ensure a modest defense capability," points out the development of the detente process in the region and admits that the international community is retreating from ideological confrontation and is entering an era of dialogue and cooperation. As has been admitted by Diet Minister Misoji Sakamoto, the Soviet military threat has decreased and Soviet troops in Siberia no longer represent "a potential threat" to Japan.

The latest admission is especially symptomatic, for all previous military preparations in Japan were based on the presence of precisely such a mythical threat.

Nevertheless, beating the drum in connection with the new trends in this country's military policy would probably be premature. First, the new military program speaks not of a reduction or even of the freezing of military expenditure, but only of a reduction of the previous pace of growth. Let us remind you that the present program proceeds from the previous one, which was compiled in accordance with all canons of the cold war. Second, this program does not at all reduce, but, on the contrary, will raise to a qualitatively new level the military might of the Japanese Armed Forces, which even today are looked upon warily in the countries of the region, especially in countries neighboring Japan.

The authors of the new program, justifying their course toward building military might, use as an argument that "the situation in the Asia-Pacific region is more complicated than in Europe," and say that such factors of instability as nationalism, "the territorial problem" etc., remain. Would it not be more logical for Japan—a strong economic power—to take upon itself the initiative for creating a new, peaceful order in the Asia-Pacific region under the conditions of the collapse of the post-war structure of the cold war?

As the country's leading opposition power, the Socialist Party of Japan believes this latest defense program still is "a remnant of the cold war." The socialists believe that Japanese military expenditure must be reduced in comparison with its present level and the government must take upon itself the diplomatic initiative for ending conflicts in Asia and for convening an Asia-Pacific conference on problems of peace and security. It is not only the opposition that is coming out with such ideas. For instance, the participants in the recent conference of Japanese ambassadors and of general consuls in the countries of the Asia-Pacific region spoke in favor of creating a mechanism for discussions on problems of securing peace and stability on the Korean peninsula. Other countries in the region also foster wishes for Japan to act in keeping with these ideas. Perhaps it is worth listening to them.

Soviet Media Restrictions in Pyongyang Viewed

SK2812062790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Commentary by Radio Moscow correspondent Viktor Krimov; From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] According to reports from Pyongyang, the North Korean authorities recently canceled the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reporter's permission to be stationed permanently in Pyongyang, and closed the Soviet News Agency NOVOSTI's branch office as well. This aroused bewilderment in the Soviet Union, making people wonder what caused it.

Viktor Krimov, Radio Moscow correspondent, has this comment to make:

Is this a complaint about Soviet foreign policy on the Korean Peninsula, or a [word indistinct] to the articles on the DPRK carried by the Soviet publications? These two combined would explain it.

Until some time ago, the Soviet publications referred to only [word indistinct] whenever they wrote about North Korea. In other words, they only reported that the people armed with the chuche idea were continuing to march without (?difficulty) and told how well the grand program to remake the country is embodied. And they noted only the constructive initiatives of the DPRK. They wrote that these initiatives promise peaceful reunification of the fatherland but that the Seoul puppets are obstructing them. These articles appealed to Pyongyang, and such [words indistinct].

However, when some articles objectively reflecting the reality of the North Korean society were carried by the Soviet publications, Pyongyang began to lose its temper. Complaints followed, which were then followed by an indecent attitude. However, when we look more objectively into the cause of this, we find that the North Korean authorities are complaining about the development of Soviet-ROK relations and the influence which the speed of the relations are having on Northwest Asia [as heard]. The assertion of the Soviet leaders that this influence is very positive is refuted by Pyongyang. We should admit that the Soviet policy toward Korea which has long (?leaned) only on the DPRK is frustrated.

We can say that the Soviet Union led the policy on the Korean Peninsula into a blind ally by [word indistinct]

supporting the program of national reunification put forward by the DPRK. The Soviet Union ignored the reality that there are two Korean states with different social and economic systems on the Korean Peninsula. In the process of separating its foreign policy from the hard ideological framework, the Soviet Union [word indistinct] its own interests and recognized the ROK as a worthy political and economic entity. Thus, the Soviet Union came to assume a true and constructive role in the solution of the issue of the Korean (?conflict).

Meanwhile, Moscow, while developing its relations with Seoul, declared that it will continue to maintain everything that has been achieved in Soviet-DPRK cooperation. The Soviet Union also declared that it would provide a new stimulant for Soviet-DPRK relations. The Soviet Union tried to improve the efficiency of the cooperation and make it mutually beneficial.

Moscow hopes that the inter-Korean dialogue will achieve tangible results [words indistinct]. It hopes that the two sides will cease military confrontation, achieve economic cooperation, and make North-South exchange succeed. Both the initiatives taken by Pyongyang and those taken by Seoul have prospects for success.

The turning point in the relations between the Korean states can be brought about by the North-South premiers' talks. In order to make these talks succeed, the two sides should be willing to make a political compromise. The Soviet publications did much to inform the Soviet people of the reality of Korea as it is, and continues to make such efforts. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and NOVOSTI were carrying out this difficult task. Regrettably, however, their Soviet readers now cannot receive reports on the DPRK directly.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Paris Talks on Cambodia Called 'Step Forward'

BK2512121190 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 24 Dec 90

[Commentary by station observer Igor Lebedev]

[Text] The talks between warring Cambodian factions within the Supreme National Council [SNC] to find a peaceful settlement to the years-long conflict in Cambodia has come to an end in Paris.

Our observer, Comrade Igor Lebedev, has the following comment:

Speaking at the opening ceremony of the meeting of Cambodia's SNC which was also attended by the representatives of the UN Security Council, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas said with some bitterness that the international community just cannot indefinitely focus on the fate of Cambodia because other priorities require and will require our attention and call for solution without any delay.

This remark by the French minister is not hard to understand. There certainly has been some foot dragging regarding the solution to the Cambodian problem which has been going on for the past 12 years. During this latest meeting in the French capital, some progress has been observed, however. The four Cambodian factions agreed on most of the main points of the settlement plan actively supported by the United Nations. This plan was drafted by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. All questions still not agreed upon will be examined soon by the coordinating committee of the international conference on peace in Cambodia. It is certainly in the final phase of this conference that a document on the comprehensive solution to the situation in Cambodia is expected to be signed.

All four Cambodian factions came close to unanimity concerning the international aspects of the Cambodian solution, but not the internal aspects. Nevertheless, they were still in disagreement regarding the question of who will be the SNC chairman. Of course, the obstacle was not on this point alone. For example, some points of the framework document concerning the national reconciliation process were interpreted by the Phnom Penh circles as aimed at dissolving the government of the State of Cambodia. This was because according to the proposed plan, the United Nations would control Cambodia during the transitional period and ensure a cease-fire between the warring factions. Would the Phnom Penh authorities who, according to some survey, are in control of at least 90 percent of the country be happy to be removed from their post? Furthermore, in Phnom Penh, people are seriously worried that the proposed plan would not sufficiently guarantee the prevention of the Pol Pot gang from returning to power. Such worries are not unfounded, for the Khmer Rouge have not changed their nature in the least. This remark was written in the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE by British journalist James Pringle, who recently went to Cambodia.

Our observer, Comrade Igor Lebedev, comments in conclusion: At any rate, I would like to consider the Paris talks between the four Cambodian factions as a step forward on the not so smooth road toward a solution to the Cambodian conflict. The factions are gradually and slowly discovering common points in the way to unravel the Cambodia knot.

Near East & South Asia

Belousov, Saddam Husayn Hold Talks in Baghdad

LD2712172690 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] Nicosia, December 27 TASS—Saddam Husayn met for three hours with Igor Belousov, deputy chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers, who arrived in Iraq as an envoy of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. No details were immediately available.

Foreign Ministry: 250 Return From Iraq

LD2812102190 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 28 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow December 28 TASS—A 250-member group of Soviet people returned to the Soviet Union from Iraq today, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS.

An interdepartmental working group headed by Deputy Prime Minister Igor Belousov was set up on August 11, 1990, on instructions from President Mikhail Gorbachev in view of the aggravation of the situation in the Gulf, to tackle matters concerning the evacuation of Soviet citizens from the Gulf area. By the time of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait (on August 2), there were 7,830 and 880 Soviet citizens in Iraq and Kuwait respectively.

A spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said recently that "the evacuation is one of the main matters that are at the center of attention of the Soviet leadership."

As a result of work by the inter-departmental group and numerous contacts between Soviet representatives and the Iraqi side, a consent to the evacuation of Soviet citizens from Kuwait was obtained.

On August 15 the first 230-member group, consisting mainly of women and children, left Kuwait. But they arrived in Moscow only on August 18. The Iraqi authorities allowed the evacuation of people from Kuwait only by motor transport across Iraq to Amman, the capital of Jordan, and from there by special Aeroflot flights.

A Soviet Government envoy succeeded in reaching agreement with the Iraqi side on the evacuation of Soviet people by Aeroflot planes directly from Baghdad. On August 24 the last group of Soviet citizens who were in Kuwait safely returned home.

At the same time efforts were made to prepare the evacuation of Soviet specialists from Iraq. The first 240-member group, consisting mainly of women and children, arrived in Moscow by an Aeroflot flight on August 28. Since then the evacuation of Soviet citizens from Iraq to the Soviet Union was carried out in accordance with a time-table. The process greatly intensified after the Iraqi side allowed an unimpeded evacuation of all Soviet citizens.

Over the past week alone, 881 people returned to the Soviet Union. There still remain 1,450 Soviet specialists in Iraq. It is planned to complete the evacuation of Soviet citizens from Iraq by January 10 of next year.

New Israeli Consul General Interviewed on Ties

LD2712185990 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The Israeli diplomat Arye Levin began work today in a new capacity—as the consul-general of Israel in the Soviet Union. Earlier Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received him and accepted the document accrediting him to this post.

Israeli-Soviet relations thus achieve a new level after much effort. "I have been in Moscow for more than two years. Much has been done during this time. I am glad that a positive result has been achieved," Levin told TASS.

"Peoples of our two countries have much in common. We are bound by historical and cultural ties. It is worth recalling that the founders of Israel came from Russia. We have put right, although still not fully, what was done in 1967, when relations between our two countries were severed. Further steps should be taken, and the first of them should be the establishment of relations between our countries at the embassy level," Arieh Levin said. He expressed hope that this would take place before next spring.

"Staff members of the Consulate-General are swamped with work on documents of Soviet Jews wishing to emigrate to Israel. My country is capable of welcoming all those who wish to come. At the same time, it will be a tremendous strain on our economy. Enormous resources will be needed to provide dwellings and create new jobs for them," Levin said.

Shevardnadze Cited on Ties

TA2712100190 Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST in English 27 Dec 90 p 1

[Report by Walter Ruby]

[Excerpt] Moscow—Soviet policy toward Israel will not change significantly under his successor, outgoing Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told Arye Levin, the new Israeli consul-general here in a Monday night meeting.

Describing the 45-minute meeting at which he was officially accredited as consul-general, Levin said that Shevardnadze did not discuss his resignation except to stress that "whoever is at the helm of the Foreign Ministry, Soviet-Israeli relations will continue to develop."

According to Levin, Shevardnadze said: "A good foundation has been laid and should serve as something to build upon. We must develop our relations further and negotiate peacefully an end to the crisis between Israel and the Arabs."

Levin said Shevardnadze indicated support for full diplomatic relations with Israel, but gave no indication as to when that might happen.

Saddam Husayn's recent threat to attack Israel in the event war breaks out "creates a dangerous situation," Shevardnadze added, stressing that the Gulf conflict "should be resolved by peaceful means."

He said that Shevardnadze stressed the need for an international conference to solve the Israeli-Arab conflict, although, according to Levin, he did not insist it was a pre-condition for full diplomatic relations. "No one will force Israel into anything," Shevardnadze said. "Israel won't have to accept a diktat."

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said that during his meeting with Levin, Shevardnadze said that the world must now concentrate on solving the Gulf crisis, but after that "we must do our best in the interest of securing peace between Israel and the Arabs."

The Foreign Ministry issued a statement calling the establishment of consular relations between Israel and the Soviet Union "a far-reaching step toward more normal relations... that will help promote humanitarian communication, trade, and contact in the economic and other areas."

Within the next several days, the Soviets are to issue Levin with an "exiquator," a formal document allowing him to begin functioning officially as consul-general. As soon as it has been granted, he will raise the Israeli flag for the first time in over 23 years over the former Israeli Embassy building, which for the past several years has served as the consular annex to the Dutch Embassy. [passage omitted]

Kuwaiti Ambassador Says Loan Not 'Compensation'

PM2712161790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report on interview with 'Abd-al-Mohsen Yusuf al-Du'ayj, Kuwaiti ambassador to the USSR, by IAN correspondent V. Chemodin— place and date not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "Four Billion for Perestroyka"]

[Text] Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates [UAE] have adopted a decision to grant the Soviet Union a loan of $4 billion. This goodwill gesture is commented on by 'Abd-al-Muhsen Yusuf al-Du'ayj, Kuwaiti ambassador to the USSR.

First of all I would like to note that the loan granted to the Soviet Union by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the UAE was examined during the talks held by the Saudi delegation which visited Moscow recently. The loan in question is free of all conditions, that is, it is a free loan [svobodnyy zayem]. Its purpose is to help Soviet people to implement the perestroyka that was initiated by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev in the Soviet land. We believe that if the country has a strong economic potential and internal stability, the reform of its social institutions and economic structures has every chance of success.

We categorically disagree with those who state that the aforementioned loan has been given to the USSR as compensation for its position on the events taking place in the Persian Gulf. The fact is that the question of granting the loan to the Soviet Union was decided even before Iraq began to threaten Kuwait. Thus the present Soviet position on this question has nothing to do with this loan. In our view it is motivated by the high degree of responsibility with which this great power regards the new foreign policy philosophy which it has proclaimed and such fundamental problems of international security as the preservation and strengthening of peace and the removal of centers of tension.

Saddam's Foreign Policy Views Termed 'Obsolete'

NC2712142990 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 25 Dec 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Saddam Husayn has commented on the recent remarks by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on the situation. In a news conference with Spanish television, he alleged that Shevardnadze was sacrificed for having been subservient to his American counterpart Baker. Our commentator writes on this:

I think that sacrifice is a strong word if we take into consideration the fact that Shevardnadze is continuing his duties and that the acceptance of his resignation is still being discussed. Proof that Saddam Husayn's deeds are anachronistic can be seen in his amazing remarks alleging that U.S. imperialism is the indisputable superpower.

This is Saddam Husayn's reaction to the Soviet Union's new foreign policy, the basis of which is to cooperate with, not confront, the strongest power of the capitalist world—the United States—toward peace and stability in the various parts of the world.

The same applies to Saddam Husayn's reaction to the problems being faced in the restructuring of the Soviet Union. Apparently Saddam Husayn thinks that the Soviet Union can, by surrendering to Washington, free itself from problems and that the Soviet-American cooperation in establishing Kuwait's independence is a confirmation of this surrender.

A noteworthy point is that Saddam Husayn's assessment of the current international situation in which Soviet-American relations play an important role stems from his obsolete cliche thinking. The Iraqi leader cannot in any way come to terms with the new realities in the world manifested by the intensified struggle by nations for a world free from nuclear weapons and from force, a

democratic world in which there is no place for hegemonistic policies and subserviency to these policies, and a world in which the law of the jungle will be harder and harder to implement.

The large countries, namely the Soviet Union and the United States, are as interested as the smaller countries in this positive trend. In all countries, the duty of ensuring justice and human prestige and the creation of suitable, humane life are great priorities. The weak point of Saddam's regime incidentally lies here and in the fact that he wants to use hegemony, obstinacy, and irreconciliability in order to shun the responsibility to solve the fundamental problems Iraqi society faces.

There is also no doubt that Saddam Husayn counts on specific feelings in Soviet society when he thinks that his unwise and adventurous policy will win. Reference is made to the Soviet people's decisive opposition, including the Soviet military units' participation in the operations of the multinational forces for liberating Kuwait. Such feelings in Soviet society, which has only recently experienced the Afghanistan drama, are natural. But there are no common points between such feelings, reconciling approaches, and, primarily, the support for the Iraqi aggression.

But Saddam Husayn's hopes that the Soviet Union will leave the international front that has been formed to overcome the consequences of the Iraqi aggression are baseless and futile, and the important point here is not whether or not Eduard Shevardnadze is the one who is drawing up the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

Commentary Criticizes Refusal of Iraqi Food Aid

NC2812061890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 24 Dec 90

[Dimitriy Mikhailov commentary]

[Text] As has been reported, the Soviet Red Cross and Red Crescent Organization has refused to accept 500 tonnes of dates in food assistance from Iraq. This decision was justified by claiming that Iraq is facing a foodstuff shortage itself. Dimitriy Mikhailov writes on this:

I do not know what others think. But I myself am not convinced by these excuses because 500 tonnes of dates are not important for Iraq and should not even be mentioned. As stated by the head of the Iraqi Red Crescent Society, this is merely symbolic assistance in the spirit of the two countries' traditional friendship and Eduard Shevardnadze, the Soviet foreign minister who resigned, has clarified that these relations will be preserved.

Whether we have a moral right to accept Iraq's aggression against Kuwait or not is another issue. But what connection is there between our approach to the aggression and to humanitarian assistance? Why do we not reject the assistance from the Americans who were aggressive toward Grenada a few years ago and from the British who occupied the Falklands? Are those who decide whether or not we should accept assistance from Iraq truly afraid that we will be accused of showing affection to an aggressor? But apparently suspicious political interests have overcome purely humanitarian intentions.

But as for Iraq's food problems, of course such problems exist, though they did not emerge because of the sanctions that were imposed on Iraq after its aggression against Kuwait—an aggression that we strongly condemn. These problems existed a long time before this. The reason behind the economic crisis is undoubtedly the unlimited militarization of the country as well as the eight-year Iran-Iraq war. Meanwhile, it should be said that the delivery of large quantities of arms and ammunition, which ultimately helped to inflate the ego of the aggressor Saddam Husayn and to create the current Persian Gulf crisis, also played a part in this.

In connection with this, I think that refusing to accept Iraq's foodstuff assistance is nothing but an effort to save face and that by referring to the foodstuff shortage in Iraq, we are shamefully staying silent about the fact that we are also indirectly involved in bringing it about. But duplicity, as has been shown, has never had any positive results.

These are, in brief, the points that I wanted to make on the Soviet Union's refusal to accept Iraq's humanitarian assistance.

East Europe

Relations With Albania, Reforms Viewed

91UF0268A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 19 Dec 90 p 3

[Commentary by Aleksandr Oskin: "Greetings to Comrade Stalin From the Land of the Eagles!"]

[Text] Albania is a small country. It constitutes in area roughly 30 percent of Leningrad Oblast. In terms of population it has 3.2 million—approximately one-third of the total number of Muscovites. On account of its high, picturesque mountains, Albania is often called the "Land of the Eagles". Beautiful subtropical valleys, striking greenery and gentle seas create the image of a promised land.

But unfortunately real life in this Balkan republic has for many years been in stark contrast with surrounding nature. Unseen moats and fortress walls, kilometers of barbed wire, and political and economic self-isolation have made the country a destitute island, a fortress and a citadel of "genuine Marxist-Leninist theory."

Western publications call Albania an "inveterate cancer of Stalinism," a "living fossil," an "exotic anomaly" and so forth. We, however, for a number of diplomatic

reasons, have tried not to notice our former ally and former member of the Warsaw Pact.

In the Brezhnev times the central papers would once a year publish articles on the latest Albanian national holiday with wishes for normalization of our relations. This was as far as it went. Now, however, the clouds are breaking up, as it were, and things are moving in the direction of a restoration of diplomatic relations. Not only with our country. The heavy gate in the fortress wall of the "Land of the Eagles" is slowly opening. Before us is a part of our history. A part of our guilt, a piece of "wild" socialism.

Changes have begun in Albania. It is being shaken by mass meetings, strikes, and increasingly frequent unrest. But all its problems are painfully familiar.

In 1961 Enver Hoxha severed relations with the USSR, later with China. Left in practical solitude, the people's socialist republic began to prepare for defense. The entire country was covered by a system of pillboxes and bunkers. The cities began in a literal sense to resemble military camps. Dissidents were brutally suppressed. Attempts to leave the country were punished by the death penalty. The brutality was on the Stalin level. Religious propaganda was declared a state crime.

The economic situation was appalling also. The absence of elementary merchandise, a total rationing system, an archaic industry and helpless agriculture, inoperative oil fields, and rare "party schedule" automobiles on the streets. It had reached the point where the Albanian Workers Party was forced at its congress in 1986 to recognize as a priority task the provision of a sufficient quantity of drinking water for the countryside and populated areas. All this to the slogans of "Glory to Marxism-Leninism!" and in the presence, so to speak, of numerous portraits and busts of Comrade Stalin.

I was once in a discussion with a group of young Hungarians. The young people were with a great deal of aggressiveness accusing the Soviet Union of Stalinist repression. They even employed as an argument the fact of the extermination of Bela Kun, a leader of the Communist Party of Hungary, in the torture chambers of the NKVD [precursor to KGB] in 1939. To my attempts to soften, if only somewhat, their assault with a reminder of the considerable sacrifices of the Soviet people in the years of the punitive measures, my opponents objected: This was your internal business. But they were unwilling to forgive the export of "Stalinism" to other countries, to Hungary, in particular. It was hard to take issue with them.

Unfortunately, there are in our day people who continue to defend the bloody Stalin regime. In our northern capital, as has become known, the unshakeable principles of the "shining" past are forcing Stalinists to unite in independent parties. Something similar is being observed in Georgia also. What do these people seek? What do they want?

Let them show us just one spot on the planet where their model of socialism produces normal, not poisonous, shoots. Let them show a "socialist" land not stained with the blood of the innocently repressed. And let them go to Albania, Cambodia, or even to Romania and persuade the local peasants of the advantages of the Stalinist model of life and land tenure.

I wish to announce for these people, the "right," in modern parlance, that as of January this year the first attempts were made in Albania to remove the busts of I. Stalin.

The very form of the Albanian reforms is interesting. This country's leader, Ramiz Alia, has cautiously but consistently begun to implement all at once all that occurred in our country at the time of the Khrushchev thaw and in the years of perestroyka.

The Albanian Workers Party Central Committee this summer adopted a program of the privatization of small trade and crafts.

The deconsolidation of agriculture is envisaged and the sale of food at market prices is being allowed. The nomination of alternative candidates is being encouraged at various elections. Finally, the legislature has abolished the death penalty for an attempt to flee the country. The institution of a bar association was introduced here on 1 November for the first time in the state's history.

At the 13th Plenum of the Albanian Workers Party Central Committee on 11 December of this year, R. Alia won a convincing victory over the conservatives, simultaneously expelling from the Politburo seven conformists. New parties have emerged in the country, and general elections with multiple candidates are being prepared.

The recent December events in Tirana, Shkoder, and other cities attracted the world's attention. Albania has taken over the baton from Romania, as it were, entering a period of radical revolutionary change at the end of the calendar year. The difference is merely that the democratic forces are at this stage rallying around the party leader and giving him full support. R. Alia is confidently growing into an important and bold reformer.

I believe that the Albanian political leader has accelerated the pace of democratic transformations in the country not so much from his own good will as under the pressure of circumstances—the economic difficulties, the disturbances, and the increasingly frequent escapes from the country, and also under certain pressure from the international community.

We, the Soviet side, should also be thinking here about our positions with respect to Albania. However difficult things may be for us today, we should not forget that things are even worse for the Albanians. They have lived for more than 30 years without, as they say, asking either a kopek or a cent of anyone, and they have lived,

incidentally, by the precepts and the model which we once threw them like grain. Their life today is not the fault of the Albanians. This is their misfortune. We, to put it politely, are involved to some extent. I realize that my suggestion will find few supporters today and will not be all that popular. But I propose that Albania be granted economic and moral assistance. It is a small country. Despite all our commodity starvation, there are still ways in which we could help.

The walls and obstacles are coming down and trust is growing in Europe. The continent, our common home, is becoming increasingly crowded. Nor have we been in it all that long. But meanwhile we are doggedly learning to suffer and reproach ourselves. It seems to me that it would be a good thing to give thought also to our neighbors, those who are weaker, and extend a hand to them.

West Europe

CPSU's Semenova Interviewed on PCF Congress

PM2712163990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA and TASS correspondents V. Bolshakov and S. Batyrev: "French Communist Party Congress Over"]

[Text] St Ouen (Seine-St Denis Department), 22 Dec—The Marseillaise and the International, two revolutionary anthems which were born here in France, are inseparable for this country's Communists because in their unity they symbolize the colors of France. Once more they rang out beneath the roof of the St Ouen Stadium, announcing that the jubilee 27th French Communist Party [PCF] Congress coinciding with its 70th anniversary had ended.

The forum's delegates have done a lot of work. The congress' final document, adopted yesterday by an absolute majority of delegates, is the PCF's program of struggle in the years ahead.

French Communists believe, the 27th congress document notes, that the most important characteristic of the present era is mankind's desire to broaden democracy in all spheres of social life. In this process the "former leaders of the East European countries did not know how, could not, or did not want to take into account the new reality and the needs of our era whereas the leaders of the capitalist countries managed to understand that even if their system cannot satisfactorily answer those needs it must nevertheless take them into consideration."

Of course, the document goes on to say, the world's richest countries are capitalist. They outstrip the rest in technological development and in their economic and commercial might. "However, whereas a tiny minority of people in those countries live in luxury, their peoples are increasingly facing inequality, deteriorating material conditions, constant mass unemployment, racism, discrimination, and the undermining of the basic freedoms."

Elections to the leading organs of the PCF were held today. Georges Marchais was re-elected secretary general of the PCF.

We asked G.V. Semenova, head of the CPSU delegation to the congress and member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for her impressions. In an interview for PRAVDA she said:

"I personally remember the atmosphere reigning at the congress. As we saw for ourselves, the fate of socialism and peace are vitally important for the PCF. The PCF is looking to the future. And it is logical that G. Marchais' report and the delegates' speeches contained highly optimistic plans and expressed hope that a broader social base will be gained and new forces enlisted. This appeal to the future was distinctively stressed by the youthful faces of the delegates—almost the majority of delegates fell into that category.

[PRAVDA] How did you perceive the speakers' verdict on the situation in our country?

[Semenova] What I heard at the congress was... not criticism of us but a publicly expressed concern over how things are going to go in our country and whether our party will cope with its present difficulties. Overall, our relations are most friendly, the PCF expresses solidarity with perestroyka and with the socialist choice which the CPSU defends. Georges Marchais met with journalists during the congress and said among other things: "We want to confirm our solidarity with Soviet Communists and with their General Secretary now more than ever before so as to advance along the path of socialism."

[PRAVDA] Apart from being constantly present in St Ouen attentively watching the congress' work, you had another job to do, "out of sight" of the hall, first and foremost the numerous meetings and conversations that you had, and not only with the PCF leadership...

[Semenova] Yes, we met with representatives of many parties—from China, Portugal, Italy, South Africa, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Palestine, Switzerland, Cyprus, Cuba, Greece, the Czech and Slovak parties, Nicaragua, and Chile. The dialogue with each of these delegations is important for us. And it is also important that the interlocutors stressed their solidarity with Soviet people, perestroyka, and the CPSU, as well as their readiness to support us in every way. And there were so many fraternal greetings at the congress—from the party organizations with which our communists maintain ties and from communist mayors...

[PRAVDA] Commenting on the results of the congress, the press has been drawing attention to the PCF's initiative: To give a new lease of life to the world communist movement. Were any specific prospects on

this matter or possible organizational forms discussed during your meetings and conversations, or was this examined just as an idea?

[Semenova] We support the initiative even though at the moment it is only an initiative. There were talks with representatives of other communist parties to the effect that it is necessary to meet and talk and discuss our common problems. At the moment it is hard to say how this will turn out... On the whole, G.V.Semenova said in conclusion, we are taking from here many impressions and interesting and instructive experience.

Gremitskikh Views Presence in Germany, Aid

AU2712141990 Berlin BERLINER ZEITUNG in German 22-23 Dec 90 p 2

[Interview with Yuriy Gremitskikh, deputy spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry, by Frank Herold in Berlin; date not given: "People in the Soviet Union Should See the Aid as an Impulse"]

[Text] [Herold] The Soviet Guard is leaving the memorial in the Zoo today. What do you feel in view of this symbolic step?

[Gremitskikh] The Guard is leaving and the memorial should remain. Soviet soldiers did not only die for the Soviet Union. They also died for the Germans. I am in favor of keeping the memorial, not for bureaucratic-official reasons—or just because the Two-Plus-Four Treaty provides for the cultivation of monuments. This memorial, which is so close to the Reichstag building in central Berlin, should remain a common memorial.

[Herold] You are stressing the commemorative aspect. However, as Soviet troops start withdrawing from Germany, tensions are increasing between the Germans and Soviet soldiers. What can the Soviet side do to reduce these tensions?

[Gremitskikh] I am in Berlin now to discuss with representatives of the German authorities and of our Western group what information can be provided to ensure normal and, if possible, friendly relations between our troops and the population. Of course, this is a big political and human problem. One must be aware of the fact that these Russian boys, who sometimes come from the deepest countryside, have been transferred to a completely different life, to a completely different atmosphere. On the one hand they are members of the military. They are doing their service, just like in Siberia or on the Volga. However, when they leave the barracks, they see a completely different life. This naturally leads to tensions, politically and psychologically. I would like to remind people of Chancellor Kohl's words. We want the Soviet soldiers to return home as friends of the German people, he said. This is very good and true. However, both sides must deal with each other very carefully. We are currently going through the initial stage of a four-year process, as agreed upon. We must cooperate closely during this period so that the Soviet soldiers will indeed leave Germany as friends and that the Germans will continue to be the friends of the Russian soldiers.

[Herold] How do you assess the political and psychological situation in the Soviet Union, as far as Germany is concerned?

[Gremitskikh] It is not easy. You must take into consideration that the Soviet Union lost countless soldiers in the war. The consequences of the war can still be felt today. Millions of people in the Soviet Union have not forgotten the war. Politically-minded people naturally see the changes in the East in a sober and realistic way. The actual goal of Soviet policy was stipulated in the Potsdam documents. Germany should be united, democratic, and entertain friendly relations with all former opponents, including the Soviet Union. We have returned to the old goal of the Allies of the anti-Hitlerite coalition.

[Herold] One cannot speak about German-Soviet relations these days without mentioning the relief supplies. What role do they play in the Soviet Union? What are the reactions of the Soviet people?

[Gremitskikh] People are grateful for this human act of solidarity. Of course, there is also a little bitterness. The Soviet Union is a huge and rich country with a vast land. All of a sudden, we are destabilized and disorganized now, so that we need help from abroad. However, I do not want to create the slightest impression that, despite the help that is being provided, people are still not satisfied. It is important that the aid comes from the heart, and that the donor does not view the recipient as a beggar.

[Herold] Do you have the impression that this danger exists?

[Gremitskikh] No, but I read words like "aid to relieve the famine" in some German papers. This is naturally a temporary and very humanist aid. I hope that our people understand this operation in the right way, that they see it as an stimulus to work more efficiently.

[Herold] Another question that arose recently was how the Soviet Union will handle Bonn's request for the extradition of former GDR leader Erich Honecker.

[Gremitskikh] This is indeed a very complicated problem. I want to exclude the political and legal side. I believe that one must see the human side. I do not think that this issue is so important for people in Germany. The eastern laender are facing numerous problems now. Despite this, a great deal is being said and written about former leading figures.

[Herold] Do you think that tensions could result from this question for relations between Germany and the Soviet Union?

[Gremitskikh] No, I do not think so. I believe that both sides are wise enough and that dialogue is so good at all levels that we can solve all problems without conflicts.

[Herold] How will the Soviet Union behave in this specific case?

[Gremitskikh] Talks are under way. I do not want to elaborate. I rely on the tact of both sides, and on their political wisdom.

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaraguan Military Budget Reduction Viewed

PY2712175090 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish 0100 GMT 23 Dec 90

[Valentin Mashkin commentary]

[Text] The Nicaraguan president's veto of the congressional decision to reduce the Armed Forces budget could have astonished those who are not abreast of events in Nicaragua. In fact, the country is experiencing a serious economic crisis that calls for the freeing of state funds because the war is over and the number of troops should now be reduced [words indistinct] through substantial demilitarization of the area. This subject was analyzed at a recent regional meeting.

Well, this is how things are. There is a crisis. The need to reduce the number of troops has become increasingly clear. It is necessary to do something about the excessive militarization of [words indistinct]. But we cannot yet [words indistinct]

Violeta de Chamorro has personally explained her decision, noting that she is not willing to violate the existing Army reduction plan.

An excessive reduction of the military budget would cause a very substantial reduction in the number of officers, which would in turn create new social problems. Jobs or plots of land must be given to dismissed officers; and there will be similar difficulties for soldiers.

The country is going through a difficult labor situation and agricultural land is in short supply.

A considerable reduction in the size of the Army, which for the most part is Sandinist and which has recently undergone a significant reduction, will worsen relations between the Sandinists and the president, thus undermining the fragile national accord that is now taking shape. I believe that President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro and former officials of the previous government are making efforts to strengthen this national accord.

This, however, is not everything. Uneasiness prevails in the country. The celebration of Christmas has been affected by attacks by ultrarightists and Contras against [words indistinct] state officials. A few days ago, the Contras seized the Jalapa police barracks for a short time. Casualties were reported during the incident.

We should also recall that an anti-government plot was discovered one month ago. The plotters wanted to oust Chamorro and then hit the Sandinists with the help of the former Contras seeking to strip the Sandinists of the strong political positions that they have even within the opposition. In other words, the ultrarightists, those who failed to defeat the Sandinists in the battlefield, want to destroy them now that they are the opposition.

This could cause a civil war, the same type of war that took so much effort to end not long ago. A civil war would really be a misfortune for Nicaragua and for the whole of Central America whose situation is now quite complicated because of the Salvadoran armed conflict.

I think that a non-provocative settlement [words indistinct] when plots are planned and policies are harmed, the Army plays a stabilizing role, and a sudden reduction [words indistinct] would be disadvantageous.

Well, that is my opinion.

Congress of USSR People's Deputies

Yanayev Elected Vice President on Second Ballot

Results 'Officially Announced'

LD2712161790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)—Gennadiy Yanayev, aged 53, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has been elected USSR vice president, according to the results of the second round of voting.

This was officially announced today at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

In the second round, 1,237 votes were cast for Gennadiy Yanayev and 563 against. To be elected he had to receive the support of 1,120 deputies.

In the first round, the candidate for vice president received 1,089 votes, with 583 against.

Deputies Voice Support for Yanayev

LD2712135490 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today renominated Gennadiy Yanayev for his deputy after he fell short of the required majority of votes to fill the newly-instituted office of vice-president.

Most of the 20 speakers in the ensuing confirmation hearing at the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies supported Yanayev.

"Let's back our president and Communist Party general secretary," Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev exhorted Communist deputies.

Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev spoke along the same lines, arguing that Yanayev's election would enable Gorbachev to immediately begin sorting out the nation's economic woes.

Interestingly enough, several speakers supported Yanayev even if voting against him earlier in the day.

Salambek Khadzhiyev, director of a large factory in the northern Caucasus, explained his turnabout, for example, by saying that like many of those initially objecting to Yanayev, he does not oppose Gorbachev and just tried to warn him against a possible hasty move.

"We are tired of the incompetence often demonstrated in the upper echelons," he said.

Gorbachev's firm support for Yanayev, however, convinced Khadzhiyev that the president's choice must have been well-considered.

Just a handful of speakers against Yanayev were hardly noticeable against the overall supportive background. This may signal a possible shift during the second round of voting, which took place during a break in congressional proceedings.

Yanayev Gives News Conference on Election

LD2712181990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1730 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent Ivan Ivanov from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)—"I am an adherent of the building of socialism," USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev declared today. He was speaking at a news conference here soon after his election to that post at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Gennadiy Yanayev explained that by socialism he understands "a society that realizes not only the vital interests of man, but also his spiritual interests."

In answer to a question about the functions of the vice president, Gennadiy Yanayev said he "must carry out the instructions of the president, and the president, in view of his dynamic character, could give any instructions." The vice president added that he must also stand in for the president when the latter is absent or unable to carry out his duties. Finally, Gennadiy Yanayev will "exercise control functions and engage in specific emergency programs," which, as he put it, "unfortunately arise in our country every day."

Replying to a question by the TASS correspondent as to whether, when he was being put forward for the post of vice president, his candidature had been discussed with anyone apart from the president, Gennadiy Yanayev said he heard of the proposal that he should stand for that office from Mikhail Gorbachev the day before the nomination. "Then the proposal was examined in the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU and received support," he added.

In the course of the news conference Gennadiy Yanayev spoke strongly against claims heard at the congress that "the collapse of the country was coming from Russia." "We engendered the collapse of the country ourselves, when we practically brought matters to a crisis, to a paralysis of power; when we embarked upon a legal bacchanalia in the country; when we destroyed many of the moral reference points on which our country rested."

Gennadiy Yanayev said that in the post of vice president he will "try to ensure that ethnic conflicts will not come to a head."

'Highlights' Reported

LD2712223990 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] [Announcer] After his election to the post of Soviet vice president on Thursday Gennadiy Yanayev held a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. Vyacheslav Terekhov writes the following:

Speaking of his first steps, Gennadiy Yanayev said that as vice president he should once again consider the set of problems related to the country's economic life, paying special attention to ways of normalizing interethnic relations that are one of the greatest destabilizing factors in the country. Here is his reply to a question about the greatest difficulty for him as vice president:

[Begin Yanayev recording in Russian fading to English translation] I think the greatest difficulty for me in my new position will be to remain myself, because we will evidently have to make difficult and sometimes probably dramatic decisions. The situation in the country requires this. It is very important not to fall for unpredictable, spontaneous decisions. Everything should be weighed carefully before making any decisions. [end recording]

As a representative of the Communist Party leadership, Yanayev was asked what was the biggest mistake in his opinion made by the previous leadership of the party.

[Begin Yanayev recording in Russian fading to English translation] I think the biggest mistake was that when it started perestroyka the party did not take care about the political, theoretical, and even organizational and psychological preparation of the party for this change. I still believe the Communist Party is the biggest political force today. That's why I think that those who voted against me did not vote against Yanayev as a person, that was a vote for or against the president. The results of the voting, especially in the first round, reflected the political struggle for power in the country. [end recording]

Gennadiy Yanayev went on to say that he favors the transition to a market system, but without the expense inherent in capitalism. We must not idealize the market. We should realize that the market is a tough system, that is why we should plan such a transition mechanism that would protect the 70 million Soviet people living below or close to the poverty line during the transitional period.

Those were highlights of a new conference given by Gennadiy Yanayev after his election to the post of Soviet vice president.

Expresses Support for Perestroyka

AU2712215490 Vienna ORF Television Network in German 2100 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Interview with Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev by Veronika Seyr; in Moscow, on 27 December 1990—recorded; Yanayev statements in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Seyr] Mr. Vice President, Austrian Television would like to ask you a question.

[Yanayev] Please, go ahead.

[Seyr] Do you approve of the path of perestroyka or do you also see mistakes? Where did President Gorbachev make mistakes?

[Yanayev] I have always been a supporter of perestroyka. Nevertheless, there have been serious divergences. I believe that we did not think enough about the consequences, particularly in the economic area. We should have always been a few steps ahead. Now it is very difficult to put the country in order again. Moreover, there are forces who are deliberately disturbing the process, who want to lead the country into disaster. I will help to eliminate these forces.

[Seyr] What forces are these?

[Yanayev] They are harmful, that is all I want to say; no comment.

Comments on Gorbachev Japan Visit

OW2812034990 Tokyo KYODO in English 0319 GMT 28 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 28 KYODO—Newly-elected Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev said Thursday that while President Mikhail Gorbachev's scheduled visit to Japan in April will stimulate the bilateral relationship it will not settle the territorial dispute between the two countries.

Yanayev, in a press conference after being elected as the Soviet Union's first vice president, said the slated trip will be a "big stimulation" to turn Soviet-Japan ties in a better direction.

But he ruled out that "a single visit" by the president can solve the issue of Japan's claim to four islands off northern Japan seized by the Soviet Union after Japan surrendered at the end of World War II, and urged Japan not to expect too much on the territorial issue from Gorbachev's upcoming trip.

Yanayev, a Soviet Communist Party Politburo member, was elected vice president in a second ballot by the Soviet parliament Thursday, after failing to obtain a majority in the first round of voting. Gorbachev asked the deputies to vote again, saying he needed a vice president he could trust.

Yanayev, who has visited Japan about a dozen times, said that while in Tokyo in October as a Politburo member he warned the Japanese side "not to hope that Gorbachev will bring to them two islands in one of his pockets like Santa Claus, and two other islands are in his other pocket."

He added that during the trip, he had denied Japanese press reports indicating the Soviet Union is ready to give back two islands to Japan based on the 1956 Soviet-Japanese Joint Declaration, which stipulated Moscow's future return of two of the disputed islands.

The declaration ended the state of war which existed since the Soviet Union declared war on Japan on August 9, 1945 and started invading Japanese-held areas including Manchuria, southern Sakhalin, and the Kuril Islands.

Yanayev, however, said the 1956 declaration has in it "many principles" that can be used in other forms to prepare for a bilateral peace treaty, which Tokyo and Moscow have yet to ink to upgrade their ties.

Japan insists on the return of the islands as a precondition for the signing of such a pact, whereas the Soviet side insists a peace treaty be concluded first to start improving the bilateral relationship.

The vice president's reference to the 1956 document seems to indicate a shift from the Kremlin's current official stance that there exists no territorial question between the two countries and therefore that Japan's claim to the islands has no legal basis.

Congress Closing Day Proceedings Detailed

LD2712175390

Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 27 December begins carrying a recording of the proceedings of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow on 27 December.

Chairman Lukyanov invites the deputies to register. There is a quorum.

At 1601 GMT General Gromov takes the floor. It is 11 years since troops were sent into Afghanistan. Gromov asks for a minute of silence in their honor.

At 1602 GMT Yanenko, secretary of the congress, takes the floor. A report of the Secretariat's work will be published in IZVESTIYA. Mistakes have been made because the work of the Secretariat has been complex, but these mistakes have been kept to a minimum. He expresses his gratitude to the members of the Secretariat for their industriousness. Gratitude is expressed to the people working in the cloakroom; the hall applauds them.

At 1607 GMT Lukyanov proposes giving the floor to Finance Minister Pavlov. Pavlov says that the country has made a resolute choice in favor of a transition to a market economy. Pavlov presents a report on the Union budget and coordination with the republics.

At 1619 GMT Mikhail Gorbachev takes the floor and speaks on the budget.

At 1636 GMT Lukyanov calls for discussion. An unidentified deputy from Dnepropetrovsk reads out a declaration of a group of Ukrainian deputies. People are saying that they are for a union, but what kind of Union? The people of the Union need to know where they are being led. Getting to a new Union treaty through anarchy is leading to civil war.

At 1638 GMT Lukyanov asks whether to adopt Gorbachev's budget proposal. Named voting is to take place. Lukyanov asks Gdlyan to calm down. Voting is first held on opening a discussion. Discussion is not to be opened, according to the vote. Lukyanov reads out a note from Deputy Romanov who says that there was no vote for Gorbachev to speak. He says it is unethical for Gorbachev to criticize the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. This wins cheers. Lukyanov defends Gorbachev's speech.

At 1644 Lukyanov says: "Comrades, I would like to speak to you calmly and I would ask you to listen to me. What is in question here? As you recall, the congress, right at the start, instructed the president together with the Council of the Federation to discuss the issue and to report to the congress—you remember this very well—to report to the congress on measures for stabilization and to hold talks on reaching an agreement on economic questions. In fulfillment of the decision of the congress it was proposed, in fulfillment of your decisions, that Comrade Pavlov should deliver a report on behalf of the government because Nikolay Ivanovich [Ryzhkov] is ill. Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev] filled out these questions.

"You have seen that an agreement has virtually been concluded on foodstuffs. A range of other agreements has been concluded. One question has been singled out here—[noise from hall] one minute, please—and it has been reported to you. We can either open a debate on it or not. The president has proposed a draft [resolution on economic issues] in which, in my opinion, there is no condemnation of the Russian legislature. If you decide to continue the debate, however, we shall continue it. It is up to you. I would only propose that these things be adopted calmly and in a restrained manner. Please.

Gorbachev asks: "A brief word, Anatoliy Ivanovich."

Lukyanov replies: "Please. The floor is given to the president. I shall then give the floor to the chairman of our Planning and Budget Commission."

Gorbachev says: "I would like, all the same, to draw the attention of deputies and the whole congress to the gist of the matter again. From the very beginning, from day one, from the first moment, and indeed in the run-up to the congress too, the main issue for us has been the present situation in the country and how to find a way out of it. In the framework of this a proposal emerged even before the congress—and it was endorsed both in the report and supported by all deputies—that a provisional economic agreement for 1991 be concluded. So, Comrade Romanov, you should not suspect that

someone or other has devised some sort of trick here. This all fits into the framework of instructions issued by the congress.

"By the way, it was stated in the decisions that this economic agreement should be concluded. Moreover, delegates have up to the last day been demanding that they be kept informed of the way in which work is proceeding, and that we should have these matters clarified before people leave for their local constituencies so that we can go back with a firm message to give to people about what we have brought with us. A question arises, so you have suspicions and cast them in a dramatic light! You, Comrade Gdlyan, are getting worked up over nothing. I want to say I think that, exacerbated though the situation is, we should nevertheless avoid excluding the congress and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the Russian leadership. That would be nonsense. That is not the way we are going about things, and there is nothing of the kind in what I have proposed. The point is just to confirm our choice once again, and not to embark on a destructive route whereby other republics too must adopt this method and go their separate ways now, with prices and everything else being brought into the game and anarchy breaking loose, something that will add so much uncertainty to our already unsettled society. This is in fact an adventurist route, I can tell you.

"So the congress does have the right—and, I believe, the obligation—not just to expect a reply, but it must declare that it backs a certain course itself. This is confirmation of what we want—to get a provisional economic agreement; that's what—prior to the concluding of a Union treaty. We included this in the first decision on the situation in the country, that all this should be adopted, that the work should begin, and that economic agreements should get the whole thing moving. We must also get the budgets going in the right direction and start working normally. We all have an interest in that. So, attempts to impute that someone is trying something political here! This is in fact within the framework of what the congress instructed. Furthermore, if we, the congress, dodge this, I must say that things will be incomprehensible. Surely the congress will have expressed its viewpoint? There are no condemnations in these points, aside from the fact that there are instructions as to the principles along which the work should be brought to a conclusion."

At 1649 GMT Lukyanov wants to read the proposal; if necessary it can be handed out. He calls for calm. He reads out the proposal on the formation of budgets for 1991. The proposal recommends calling on the USSR president to take measures to set up funds for the stabilization of the economy. Lukyanov hopes that this clears up the question of what the deputies will be voting for.

At 1651 GMT Lukyanov asks Finance Minister Pavlov if he has a written copy of his speech to copy for the deputies. He has not.

At 1652 GMT Tsyplayev says that he thinks the majority of deputies did not vote for the opening of discussion. Kucharenko says that it is not a question of condemning this or that legislature, or of contrasting the Union legislature with the RSFSR legislature. It is a question of the very existence of the Union. There is no place here for emotions. Gorbachev is proposing a decree on a fund for the stabilization of the economy.

At 1657 GMT Lukyanov makes a suggestion on the proposal: After the interval, voting will be repeated on whether to discuss it or vote directly on it.

An unidentified deputy says that the proposal's adoption in the form it is put forward, without discussion, will just increase the conflict. The Council of the Federation must study this question during the time of the working of the congress so that it is clear which income and and outgoings each republic has. The sole purpose of the proposal is to keep budgetary control in the hands of the center.

At 1700 GMT Lukyanov suggests that Yeltsin be invited to expound his stance.

At 1702 GMT Deputy Kazakov, chairman of Editorial Commission, begins the discussion of the draft law on referenda. He notes the various proposed amendments, many of which are only minor. He reads out the proposed amendments to the law's various articles which have been incorporated in the draft. He notes some of the procedures which will be necessary for the holding of referenda. He also describes some of the amendments proposed which were not incorporated into the draft and cites the reasons for this. For example, compulsory participation is rejected. He asks for the draft to be voted on as a whole.

At 1716 GMT Lukyanov asks for questions. Deputy Kazarin, speaking from the floor, asks a question on referenda concerning the secession of a republic from the USSR. Such a referendum will concern only the inhabitants of a given republic, Kazakov replies.

Deputy Shchelkanov makes a point, followed by Deputy (Plotnik) concerning Article Four. Kazakov gives examples of what types of circumstances might require a Union referendum to be carried out in only a limited territory. Deputy Obolenskiy mentions that he proposed various amendments to this law which were not adopted by the commission.

At 1725 GMT Lukyanov asks how the deputies will proceed. Is the law to be adopted article-by-article or as a whole? A vote is taken on whether to adopt it as a whole. It is to be adopted as a whole with the amendments proposed by the commission. The law as a whole is put to the vote, and the law on referenda is adopted.

At 1728 GMT Deputy Kazarin comes to the floor to add a postscript on the law on referenda. Lukyanov moves business on. Is the law to come into immediate effect? A vote is taken: The law is to come into immediate effect.

At 1730 GMT Gorbachev comes to the floor to inform the deputies about the health of Ryzhkov.

Gorbachev says: "Regarding the state of health of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. His state of health is serious but has not worsened. The most competent specialists are involved in his treatment. They are engaged around-the-clock in this work. I spoke to him yesterday, and we talked. However, his state of health is serious. When asked how the illness is proceeding, the doctors' answer is: The illness is proceeding in line with its gravity. Well, comrades, everything possible is being done, and the foremost specialists are now involved."

Lukyanov interjects: "The second announcement..."

Gorbachev continues: "He accepted the greetings from the congress and was very grateful, but I think he needs to avoid excitement as much as possible."

At 1731 GMT Lukyanov reports that Yeltsin has gone to Yakutsk, so he is unable to come to the congress. Only Silayev can be invited, if he is here.

At 1732 GMT an interval is announced. Then the announcer says that the congress continued.

Lukyanov says that work will continue. Osipyan, the head of the tellers commission, reports that Yanayev did not recieve sufficient votes to be elected vice president. He notes that many ballot papers were either destroyed or not collected. There were also abstentions.

At 1737 GMT Lukyanov asks for questions. Deputy Mironova says that unused papers should not be considered part of the vote. An unidentified deputy complains about people wasting time by collecting their ballot papers and then not using them. Deputy Yermolayev says that it is unpleasant that at such a serious time people should act in such a way. Is this the way they represent their constituents?

At 1743 GMT Lukyanov says it is possible there can be a re-vote. He asks for discussion on this. Deputy Aksenov proposes adding another candidate. Deputy Lovikon says the election proceeded normally and the tellers commission protocol should be confirmed. Deputy Alferov says the same. He says there is no shame in Yanayev not gaining a sufficient number of votes. Deputy (Konorovskaya) from Moldova says that those deputies who did not use their voting papers should be removed from the deputies' register. Deputy Shchepanovskiy says he was one of those who did not use his papers because he could not decide whether he was for or against. Another deputy says that this explanation is not a justification. A further deputy calls for the protocol to be adopted.

At 1749 GMT Lukyanov calls for vote on confirming the tellers commission protocol. It is confirmed. Lukyanov then Lukyanov gives the floor to Gorbachev at 1751 GMT.

Gorbachev says: "I agree with the decision that the congress has adopted on the results of the voting. I think that this is the way it should be, so that especially when major matters are being decided no pretexts may arise and no grounds may be created for speculation of any kind or sort.

"We have now finished one stage and are going on to another. I consider that at this fourth congress we need to decide the issue of the vice president, because we shall have to tackle many cadre matters in the very near future. We need to act so that we do not linger long over this change of gears and over this renewal and creation, so to speak, of a new team, since now everyone will be awaiting their fate to be decided and everything will be inactive, precisely at a time when there is a need for action.

"Frankly speaking, this is our last chance, and further, I think, if this leadership does not secure a breakthrough, it needs to be removed from the political scene. I think that this task is already being tackled by others—those forces who have previously wanted a house-cleaning, beginning with this congress—but I think that they did not get this. But we must not make them a gift by our disorganization and irresolution at subsequent stages. I do not think that we shall allow them such a luxury.

"That, so to speak, has been as an introduction. Now the fact that only 583 people, or 25 percent of the total number of deputies, voted against Comrade Yanayev makes it possible for me to ask the esteemed congress once again to agree to my proposal. I am again putting forward the candidacy of Comrade Gennadiy Ivanovich Yanayev for election as vice president. [some applause in hall] I think that yesterday you made your acquaintance, and we can continue this acquaintanceship. Yesterday not everyone was able to speak, as was stated by Comrade...[pauses]"

Lukyanov interjects: "Shapovalenko."

Gorbachev continues: "Shapovalenko. This made him carry off the ballot list, although I know that a decision to carry off the ballot list had been made in certain circles even before the nomination of Yanayev. Well, nevertheless, once these arguments are introduced, it is necessary to remove this concern and hold a more detailed discussion, I am confident that we shall reach agreement that the candidacy of Comrade Yanayev is suitable as regards his personal, political, and businesslike qualities and his maturity. As for tastes, it is just one of those things. One has a struggle in society, the line-up of certain forces and the crystallization of positions. I want to have alongside me a person whom I trust completely at this very difficult turning point in life. Please discuss this."

At 1754 GMT Lukyanov thanks Gorbachev and discussion begins. Deputy Kugoltinov says he is sure that the electorate believes the deputies will implement their will.

Deputy Mironova says it is shameful that Yanayev, of the younger generation, was not appointed. She proceeds

to praise his character: He is a very peaceful, calm person. She appeals to Mikhail Gorbachev: If Yanayev fails to be appointed again, then recommend a woman.

Chernyakov of Kiev is very dissatisfied with what is going on in the hall. He does not wholly understand what is going on. Why should those who did not vote or voted against be put to shame? There is no need to do this. If we can't vote against, as I did, then there is no point in these votes and this congress. People's arms should not be twisted.

At 1802 GMT Lukyanov cuts him off to say that no one is twisting anyone's arm, and asks him not to use such "unparliamentary" language. Akhromeyev takes the floor. He agrees with Gorbachev's words that the situation now is extremely acute. A political struggle is taking place. One must choose one's side, and not be involved in sabotage. Kutsenko takes the floor and calls the whole thing a spectacle. He is cut off by Lukyanov.

At 1805 GMT Yakovlev says that he did not speak yesterday, as Yanayev is his friend and he thought it unseemly. However, he now proceeds to speak in favor of Yanayev. Zolotukhin says that Yanayev's introduction to the hall was very brief and did not give a clear picture: He is a hard worker. He calls on all participants in the congress to ponder the situation in the country and asks for votes for a strong helper for Gorbachev.

Yeremey, from Moldova, remembers how Ryzhkov was voted in as prime minister. He remembers how much he suffered and how many reproaches he faced. One has to be a titan of health to withstand this. One should rather ponder one's past actions than send flowers. If there is no union, there will be civil war. Sabotage of perestroyka is under way. It is a shame for people not to vote. Yeremey has known Yanayev for 15 years and says he is very communicative. He calls on Communists to vote for Yanayev.

Supranov, a trade union deputy, says that the president needs to carry through the cause more firmly. Supranov is sure that Yanayev will move things in the right direction

At 1817 GMT Khadzhiyev says that many of those who voted negatively were Gorbachev supporters who wished to warn him from taking a precipitate step. We need competent people to run the economy. Gorbachev supporters are in a difficult position; they want to warn the president on the one hand, but on the other they wish to support him. Therefore, he now recommends that deputies vote for Yanayev. He also asserts that elements in the government are interested in keeping things as they are, with large expenditure on the military-industrial complex.

Azarov says that we have one motherland—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We have voted for Gorbachev as president, so that perestroyka is implemented. Why do we vote against his recommendations? He calls for votes for Yanayev.

Podberezskiy thinks there are many people in the hall who should not be there. People's deputies should wear their people's deputies' badges, and no others. He, personally, does not see the need for a vice president; but if there is a need, so be it. Yeltsin is going left; others to the right. Some in the center. I will vote for Yanayev, he says.

Chernichenko is proud of belonging to the congress that implemented the democratic choices of perestroyka. He stresses that there is only one person to vote for.

At 1826 GMT Nazarbayev says we are talking about defects in government in order to achieve improvements. We have just heard about next year's budgets. Thankfully, we [Kazakhs] have no ethnic problems; but if we do not act quickly, we could have. The year 1991 is especially critical. We hope that Gorbachev's cabinet will be worthy of the task of these difficult conditions. As far as Yanayev is concerned, Nazarbayev supports his candidature. He will cope with his tasks. Gorbachev needs support. Another deputy says: We can influence the situation in the country by voting for Gorbachev's candidate. The deputy approves of Nazarbayev's approach.

At 1833 GMT Krayko says Yanayev is needed as a man who can consolidate society. Yanayev, as chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, managed to settle relations with the Americans. He managed the problem of the Crimean Tatars. And the president is showing firmness, just as Yeltsin kept choosing Shakrayev.

At 1835 GMT (?Kryzhkov) says he was preparing to criticize Gorbachev very strongly for the situation in society. However, although he would have chosen Oleynik, he will support Gorbachev's candidate. He says that the voting was quite correct and that criticism constitutes sour grapes.

(Mikheda), a veteran, says he voted for Yanayev not because he personally knows him, but because he is the president's man, because he is relatively young, and because many people spoke up for him. He calls for support for Yanayev.

At 1841 GMT Lukyanov says that 17 people have spoken, and the time limit will be cut from three minutes to one minute.

A Mordovian unidentified deputy argues that if we ask someone else to take the post then he will have an excuse if he fails.

Blokhin says that Yanayev has strong positions—the equality of citizens and preservation of the union—and therefore asks for support for him, especially as Gorbachev wants this.

Goncharov says that we are not voting for a second secretary. Goncharov, a member of the Interregional Group, calls for cooperation and votes for Yanayev, in support of the president.

At 1845 GMT voting takes place on the cessation of debate. Lukyanov apologizes for not fulfilling his promise to let all speak. Debate is ends.

Shtoyk asks for a change in the voting rules to eliminate "childish pranks" which subvert the normal functioning of the congress. Borodulin, of Moscow Oblast, supports the idea of an amendment to the rules on voting. Umalatova asks for a vote on leaving just deputies' names on voting cards.

At 1852 GMT Lukyanov says that he tries to maintain a neutral position at the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet' however, he notes that there are rules in the Constitution on procedure and functions regarding voting. We now need strong, consistent executive power. For this, the congress must elect a vice president at this congres to get work started. Lukyanov reads out rules on secret ballots, to remind the deputies. Lukyanov says that he will have to take a holiday because he will lose his voice and his nerves. Lukyanov proposes a secret ballot.

At 1858 GMT it is indicated that the ballot can take place in half an hour. At 3:30 pm a secret ballot can begin. An interval is announced.

At 1900 GMT Lukyanov calls upon Osipyan, chairman of the tellers commission, to speak. Osipyan presents the protocol of the tellers commission on the renewal of the composition of the Council of the Union. He lists the number of deputies voted for from the republics. He lists deputies who were not elected from the RSFSR.

Lukyanov calls for endorsement of the protocol. He asks deputies to register again; there is a quorum. He takes a vote on endorsement of the protocol on results of the elections to the Council of the Union. This is approved by a majority of votes.

At 1912 GMT Osipyan presents the protocol on results of the elections to the Council of Nationalities. He gives details of the voting for candidates by republic.

At 1922 GMT Lukyanov proposes that the protocol on the elections to the Council of nationalities be endorsed. He takes a vote. The congress endorses the results. Osipyan says that as a result of the elections there are vacancies from four republics—the Ukraine, Armenia, and two Baltic republics.

A deputy complains of irregularities in the elections to the Supreme Soviet.

At 1927 GMT Lukyanov clarifies the points raised. Everything is in order. Deputy Gurenko condemns the unfounded claim of irregularities. Osipyan says that on this occasion the counting of votes was done mechanically, and therefore was much expedited.

At 1930 GMT Lukyanov takes a vote on whether to continue on this issue. The decision is to halt discussion of this issue and to go on to the next point. he wishes the newly-elected members of the Supreme Soviet success in their work. Lukyanov says he expects the USSR Supreme Soviet to resume its work on 8 January. It will discuss the economic plan and the budget.

Lukyanov says the next item on the agenda is the draft law on the procedure for the recall of people's deputies. He wants views on whether consideration of this might be handed over to the Supreme Soviet for consideration.

Deputy Pivovarov, chairman of a committee on work of the soviets, says this law will concern the interests of everyone here. He thinks it might be transferred for consideration by the Supreme Soviet.

Deputy Denisov, chairman of the drafting commission, also speaks on the issue.

At 1939 GMT Lukyanov says there is a proposal that this draft law be adopted in principle. He takes a vote on this. It is adopted by a majority.

Lukyanov says that the next item is endorsement of the USSR procurator general and the head of the Court of Arbitration.

At 1942 GMT the floor is given to Nikolay Semenovich Trubin, the nominee for the post of procurator general. He says local soviets have developed legal nihilism beyond all limits.

Procuratorial inspection should only be exercised in the event of a suspected case of abuse. There should be supervision of the procuracy; the procuracy cannot supervise itself. The strict centralization of the procuratorial process has been detrimental. Urgent measures needed include consolidating procuratorial work to stabilize the legal situation in the country.

At 1952 GMT Lukyanov allots some time for questions.

Desyatov puts an ecological question. What wil be done on ecological crimes? in reply, would-be procurator Nikolay Trubin promises a clampdown. Fomenko asks whether the procurator have the right to accuse someone, adducing a specific case. Trubin refuses to go into specific cases.

Trubin goes on to written questions. He considers that a nature procuracy is a side-tracking issue. On the Gdlyan affair, he says he cannot comment on what will be Gdlyan and Ivanov's fate. On the events in Dushanbe, Trubin says that the republic has adopted a decision which has changed the functions of the republican procuracy.

At 2002 GMT Lukyanov says that time for questions is up. He asks for a vote on the candidacy of Trubin. Yablokov, however, gets in a last word. He says that the procuracy of the USSR will extend the system of the procuracy with regard to ecology.

Voting on Trubin takes place. Trubin is confirmed as USSR procurator general. The next question is to

appoint Yakovlev, state arbiter, as chairman of the USSR Supreme Court of Abritration.

At 2005 GMT it is stated that Yakovlev can be both state arbiter and chairman of the USSR Supreme Court of Arbitration. Voting is held on this, and Yakovlev is appointed chairman of the supreme court of abritration of the USSR.

At 2007 GMT Orlov, deputy chairman of the Budget and Planning Commission, speaks. This morning's proceedings remind him of a person's state of shock. However, the main issue was undecided: the struggle of laws regarding the national economy. Orlov is for political sovereignty. Unfortunately, the president underestimates people's desire for sovereignty. Today, deputies should determine who is destroying the union. The time bell sounds.

At 2014 GMT Bocharov says that there has been much talk of the collapse of the union today. We are now at an impasse as to what to do tomorrow.

Chekhoyev, of Soyuz, says that we have reached an "either or" situation. If we do not sign a new Union treaty, we face the collapse of the Union. The 10 days spent here will be wasted if we do not come to an economic agreement. Secondly, what has happened in Yakutsk, that Yeltsin should absent himself? Thirdly, Gorbachev should not put forward half-measured proposals on getting out of the economic crisis.

Miroshin shares the president's concern over the budget. However, this situation dates back to the first Congress of People's Deputies declaration on sovereignty, after which all the republics followed suit. Mirashin approves of the RSFSR legislature's expenditure on the Russian countrside.

Bushuyev says that more important than sovereignty is the question of how people live. He argues in favor of meeting the demands of miners, oilers, etc. Do we really want the oilers to follow the miners in striking for better conditions? He proposes publishing the draft temporary economic agreement in IZVESTIYA.

At 2027 GMT Ergashev complains that Yeltsin is taking measures which will bring about the collapse of the state. Why is Yeltsin countermanding state laws? How can Ergashev explain to his power workers that they will not receive their next wages? Therefore, he asks the president to instruct Yeltsin to review his positions and to terminate his slogan "Russia for the Russians."

Skokov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, says that the RSFSR Council of Ministers adopted its first steps to a market economy recently and that they only slightly contradict state laws. He reads out excerpts of RSFSR legislation and argues in favor of Russian control of the RSFSR economy. He asks for an extra two minutes to argue the Russian case for the substantial subsidies envisaged by the RSFSR parliament.

Skokov says interrepublic relations must be reviewed, as they are in an appalling state. The republics must form their budgets by 20 January, and the Council of the Federation can involve itself in working out any difficulties.

An unidentified deputy doubts economic figures adduced by RSFSR's Skokov. Lukyanov invites one more question to Skokov. Skokov says that Russia produces some 70 percent of total output, but accounts for some 30 percent of consumption.

At 2043 GMT Nazarbayev apologizes for appearing a second time today. He says that Kazakhstan, like all raw material-producing states, will have a deficit, thanks to the tax system existing from January 1991. He runs off Kazakhstan production and investment figures. These figures are to refute the suggestion that Kazakhstan is subsidized by other republics.

Skokov replies that such arguments are not resolved at such congresses.

Novikov then makes a brief comment.

At 2053 GMT Karimov says that he fully supports Nazarbayev. He says that the situation is much the same in Uzbekistan as in Kazakhstan. The whole misfortune is that incomes do not cover expenditure. The RSFSR is essential to the Union because territorially it unites the other republics. From this premise, we must all approach the formation of next year's budget from a position of understanding. The Council of the Federation must complete work on the draft temporary agreement by January.

At 2059 GMT Gorbachev makes a closing statement on the national situation.

At 2105 GMT Lukyanov proposes taking note of the president's information on the draft temporary economic agreement and to instruct that work be completed on it in the shortest possible time. Nazarbayev and Karimov seem to have proposed this in their speeches.

At 2107 GMT Kucherenko proposes that the first sentence of the proposal on the draft temporary economic agreement should be changed to indicate the crisis which has arisen over the republican budgets. He insists on a timescale for the draft agreement of 10 January, without fail.

(Leshchenkov) asks for annulment of an unspecified decision adopted on 24 December. Lukyanov cannot allow this and puts the proposal on the draft temporary economic agreement.

At 2111 GMT Lukyanov announces that Osipyan has the results of the second secret ballot on the vice presidency. Osipyan announces the results. Yanayev is appointed.

Lukyanov puts the results to the Congress of People's Deputies. The results are confirmed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Results applauded.

Poltoranin asks for Denisov to give a reply to his question. Adamovich asks to speak.

Denisov speaks briefly. His commission has been charged with looking into Pylin's complaint about Poltoranin's interview with Nevzorov on Leningrad Television. No direct accusations can be made against Poltoranin, although it cannot be disregarded that some laxity was shown in the Nevzorov interview with regard to people's deputies' ethics. Therefore, the ethics committee will limit itself to this. Pylin, also, was too categorical in his accusations.

At 2122 GMT Adamovich says that when the country suffers, the Army suffers. The Army is like a huge collective farm. People's deputies start to leave the hall. Lukyanov asks Adamovich to sit down for his last remark.

At 2124 GMT Aleksandr Dzasokhov, chairman of the drafting commission, addresses the congress:

"Esteemed people's deputies. A great multitude of appeals..."

Lukyanov interrupts: "Wait, are they about the Persian Gulf?"

Dzasokhov says: "I will be coming to that shortly." Then continues:

"Appeals from Soviet citizens have been sent to the address of our congress, as has been repeatedly reported by the secretariat of the congress. Our commission, conforming to the content of these appeals, has come to the conclusion that it should prepare and propose for your attention an appeal to the peoples of the country on behalf of the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies. We have agreed, in the event of your consent, that the text of such an appeal will be submitted to people's deputies by Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov. We have also received a number of questions relating to the Soviet Union's foreign political activity: They were principally linked with the military-political situation which has arisen around the Persian Gulf. In this connection the drafting commission has prepared a draft decision, the text of which you received three days ago."

Lukyanov interjects: "There it is. You have it to hand."

Dzasokhov continues: "I would like to preface a few considerations and information. Yesterday, on 26 December, the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on the instructions of the country's president, departed for Baghdad by plane in order to undertake additional steps for the safe and earliest return of our fellow citizens who are over there. At present 1,700 Soviet citizens are in Iraq. The intention is that each week a few special flights will be laid on so that by roughly 10 January we will have implemented the common accord [reached] in our country's leadership and in the Soviet legislature, too.

"The second clause, comrade, boils down to the fact that at the present time the Soviet foreign political department and the Soviet leadership are pursuing a course toward the complete realization of the position which was taken up by the Soviet Union in the course of the Soviet-U.S. meeting on 9 September in Helsinki. And I must say that, even though very little time remains until 15 January, there are still opportunities to undertake steps which would make it possible to promote such a vision as would free this region from a military conflict.

"The draft decision which you have, it seems to me, confirms, in terms of principle, our course, our will. But I would add here a specific proposal if the congress supports this: That on the very eve of mid-January the Supreme Soviet should examine the state of affairs in the Persian Gulf region and if necessary, specify more precisely our Soviet position and the Soviet legislature's point of view. This is, properly speaking, an amendment which would broaden and enrich the submitted draft decision."

At 2128 GMT Lukyanov puts the draft proposal on the Gulf situation to the vote.

Voting cannot take place until deputies return. Registration has to take place. There is a quorum. Deputies are asked to keep their voting cards safe for the next Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The proposal is adopted.

At 2131 GMT Ulyanov reads out a declaration to the peoples of the country by people's deputies. The declaration is adopted.

At 2140 GMT Lukyanov declares the Congress of People's Deputies closed.

The Soviet national anthem is played. It is cut short, and Lukyanov wishes the people's deputies all the best for the New Year. The recording ends at 2142 GMT.

Gorbachev Comments on RSFSR Budget

LD2712194990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Speech by President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 27 December; from the "Vremya" program—recorded]

[Text] I will not be able to add many specifics to what comrade Pavlov said, but I will try to express some assessments for us to agree upon our position here at the congress. As I said yesterday, we planned to sign an agreement on the stabilization of the social and economic situation in the country before the congress completes its work. As a matter of fact, the events were developing along that line, and Comrade Pavlov has informed you that, in essence, an understanding has

been reached on the main bulk of problems and issues. And if some details have remained somewhere, this is a question of evening things out, so to speak, the way it is done, of finally harmonizing positions and formulations as is done in drawing up any documents, so to speak, especially on such a scale.

As regards the issue on which Comrade Pavlov has made a report, it emerged as early as at the meeting of republican leaders, during discussion, what approach should be taken. The subject is a provisional agreement for 1991, moreover it is a provisional agreement in the context of this complicated economic situation, when actions need to be taken without any delay. And we have already lost a lot of time. A dilemma has arisen: whether we should agree with the approach which is being adopted by the majority of republics, and make this approach the foundation of the provisional agreement, and to do this in such a way as to work thoroughly on all the positions and to exclude all sorts of unfounded approaches here—in any case we came to the conclusion that we ought to be working in this direction. Another direction means, as some republican leaders said at a meeting at that time, that if the second approach is adopted—the approach which the Russian Federation has embarked upon—well, in any case its leaders are at the stage of discussing the situation concerning the formation of the budget, of the plan and budget for 1991.

This is exactly what I mean. Then the republics will have to introduce their own changes to the mechanism of distributing revenues which are obtained from the marketing of products in the course of years and decades. To be exact, republics rich in raw materials lose out because the main income, as it were, and proceeds are realized in the final product. And through mechanisms that are now in practice, this is redistributed through subsidizing the raw-material industrial sector and by subventing and subsidizing the operation of other republics' budgets.

Hence, it is as if the situation is being balanced. However, it can never finally be balanced. Nevertheless, this mechanism exists and it has so far been operating this way. If the approach that is being recommended, or rather that comrades from the Russian Federation have embarked upon, is adopted, then—as leaders of a number of republics said—they have to go back and consider this situation, because they cannot obtain the income that should cover their republic's expenses and they will have to change their pricing policy. Hence, they have to decide, regardless of other republics' wishes, and embark upon... [changes thought] In one case these are cotton prices, in another case it is an issue of gold prices, in another, oil, gas, sugar, wheat prices, and all other prices.

If this path is accepted, then everything that has been done hitherto—even so, about 80 percent, given all the difficulties, of economic treaties have been concluded, but they were concluded on a single price basis—then all this explodes. In essence, comrades, this means that everybody lives according to the principle of every man for himself; it means disintegration, not only of the economy, but of the Union, too.

Yesterday evening I instructed... [changes thought] Having received during the day a report from the comrades who were working, Comrade Pavlov's commission met, as I have told you, and it worked with representatives from republics; I see Comrade Skokov is here, he worked on these issues with the financiers on Russia's behalf. During the evening, having spoken on the telephone with Comrade Silayev, I gave the instruction that they should meet without delay. And they met. I do not know what discussions they had, or how lengthy and so on, but the outcome of it did not lead to a change in the position, all the more so since it turns out that on this day the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation was meeting. It was discussing the principles of the budget system of the Russian Federation. And you must have noticed, there is information in today's PRAVDA on the decisions the Russians have adopted. It is quite telling. I do not know if you have simply managed to notice it. Nevertheless, today, the situation appears such that it has been announced... [changes thought] Incidentally, for one day already this system... [changes thought] The principles of this budget system have already—yesterday—been adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. This is in the context where this work is taking place within the framework of the Union, and a coordination of positions is under way, and the discussion... [changes thought] The elaboration of an economic agreement is under way.

What is envisaged? A sum amounting to 23.4 billion [rubles] from the Russian budget will go toward financing Union programs, which is 119 billion less than the current year. I will now disclose to you what this means. Yes, Comrade Kazannik, this is hardly a cause for applauding or, especially, for ecstatic and broad smiles, just the contrary. So I will say... [changes thought] What is under disucussion? What is the Union budget? What is the union budget? Allow me to cite a few figures on this. So, 51 billion in the Union budget is financing the national economy. And what is the financing of the national economy: The compensation of coal price differences, 15.6 billion; 6 billion for the Donetsk basin; almost 3 billion for the Kuznetsk basin; 800 million for the Pechora basin; 1.3 million for the Karaganda basin. This is a basic industrial sector on which everything, both metallurgy and the whole country, is dependant. It is operating under these conditions, and demands this support. There you have the first article, as it were, on the Union budget.

And further: Geological prospecting work. We need this, all of us, because this is the growth of resources, the discovery of reserves, the growth of resources on the basis of which we have to develop our economy: Just short of R8 billion rubles.

Expenditure on financing science, and fundamental research; That is, our main science, which, as it were,

drives any society and which incidentally, the whole world is hunting after; R14.1 billion.

This is the figure our fundamental science is unhappy with. The costs of financing social and cultural events, those attaining a union level—what are they? For public education, there is (?R 6.1) billion. What does this include? This includes Moscow State University, Moscow State Technological University, Moscow Aviation Institute, Moscow Energy Institute, and a number of our other—about 20 or 30, it seems—major centers for training cadres for the whole country. So what is this, is this something mythical? I am continuing further. What is subsidy for culture? Today, this means the Bolshoy Theater, the Malyy Theater, the Moscow Art Theater, philharmonic activity, the Lenin Library, and so on. That is the union budget, its cultural section, so to speak. Or, take health care. What is health care? This is the Bakulev Institute of Cardiovascular Surgery—16 million; this is the Institute of Neurosurgery, this is the Oncology Institute, the Pediatrics Institute, and so on, that is, this is our most important union science, which serves the whole country.

Finally, I approach military expenses, military expenses. As we have planned, we are reducing them by almost R7 billion, as has been made known to the whole world; these expenses are tangible, though these requirements exist, and you know the state of this problem now and how sharply it is being debated. Nevertheless, we have agreed to this reduction and have done everything correctly, but this includes the monetary allowances for servicemen, 8.3 billion; the pensions for servicemen, 4 billion; a program for social security for servicemen, 3.3 billion; the construction of housing and sociocultural amenities for servicemen, 3.5 billion, and so on. Well, naturally, this includes weapons and everything related to defense, conversion... [pauses] Law-enforcement bodies, 11 billion; specific purpose programmes—and what are specific purpose programs? Ten billion, over 10 billion for Chernobyl, about 1 billion for the Aral, the resettlement of Crimean Tatars, and so on. These, properly speaking, these are articles of the Union budget. Then we should say what we are doing. Closing down the Army or completely reforming it? Disbanding our fundamental science, and so on? This is not serious, this is simply, I would like to choose words that can be used in parliament, after all, but generally speaking, other words can be used here too, so to speak. In other words, when discussing the situation in the country we put in writing that before a Union treaty is signed, those repubican laws which are not at variance with the USSR Constitution, or USSR laws adopted within the USSR's plenary powers, are in force.

Thus we have the Constitution; and there are laws, including ones on taxes, which have been adopted, and it is on the basis of this that work on forming the plan and budget for 1991 is being conducted. I see that even despite these congress decisions, the Russian comrades do not yet understand that this requires a change in their stance. I would not put the question here so dramatically, that the Supreme Soviet of Russia should gather and cancel all its laws and everything that it has been adopting—no. The matter concerns a provisional agreement for 1991, and we simply need to suspend the action of these—whatever does not fit in—these laws that have been adopted which are not in harmony with the Constitution, in order that we can arrive at a coordinated economic agreement and not wreck the path that we have now embarked on. If the approach is different, then I must say that this is more than a war of laws; it means disintegration, and not just of the economy, but of the country.

So, if anyone wishes to be responsible for it and implement such an approach, then I must say I think this either goes to show that people lack expertise in the matter, or they are people who have dreamt up something that must be rejected resolutely, both by our congress and by the people. Therefore I would like to ask you, to ask you in connection with this...[changes thought] incidentally, while I was sitting here, yet another question was asked by a group of deputies, about 30 of them put their signatures here. What question have they asked? How is one to understand the adoption by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR law on enterprises and enterpreneur activity and the abolition of the USSR law on enterprises in the USSR? It is once again a war of laws, confrontation of legislative decisions in spite of the decisions adopted by the congress on taking the country out of a crisis. The RSFSR leadership is directing the situation in relations between the republics and the union further and further into a dead end. What are we to tell our electorate? What are your actions as president in connection with this? Do you not think it necessary to take necessary decisions to stop such a confrontation already at this congress? Well, very many people have put their signatures to this, I will not read them, so to speak. I think this relates to the same thing. It seems to me that we must follow the path that we have embarked upon. And we are close to this. I mean opting for the conclusion of an agreement, a provisional agreement, for 1991, leading on to the Union treaty, with a redistribution of powers—with a redistribution, in connection with this, of enterprises too, so to speak. It will all fall into place. If we are drawn right now into this process, which the comrades want to force through, then I have to say that we will be drawn into an adventurist episode such as will in general sweep away all of today's ruling structures, as ones which are not, speaking in general, capable of acting effectively and decisively at a crucial moment. I do not think we can allow that.

In this connection, I submit for the congress's consideration the draft of a brief resolution:

First, to take cognizance of the information about the progress of work on preparing a provisional economic agreement for 1991, and to endorse the proposals submitted concerning completion of this work. These boil down to what Pavlov has said and what I have said; we think that we must act as we have agreed and as we wrote

in the resolution on the situation in the country. To advise the Council of the Federation to insure the implementation of the aforementioned proposals.

Second, to recommend that the president issue a decree, in as short a time as possible, on the creation and use of all-Union and republican extra-budgetary stabilization funds; that he clearly define the sources for the formation of these funds, and the procedure for their coordinated use. Incidentally, there are minor disagreements here, but they need to be settled juridicaly.

Third, that the USSR Supreme Soviet complete the examination and confirmation of the plan and budget for 1991 by 10 January 1991.

Fourth, that the financial bodies and the tax inspectorates insure in their work the implementation of a unified financial policy, being strictly guided by the Union legislative acts and acts with the force of law which have been adopted.

I request the congress to adopt such instructions in the form of a resolution.

Gorbachev Makes Closing Statement, Urges Unity

LD2712222190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Speech by President Mikhail Gorbachev closing the Congress of People's Deputies 27 December session, at the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] I think we need not be afraid of the fact that we have reached a critical point in the work of the congress, connected with the critical situation in the country. In this connection, I am satisfied that the information that has been put before the congress has evoked the right reaction and helps us understand the situation in which we find ourselves and help us to work out and correctly determine methods of action. Above all, the information helps us to reach decisions on ourselves, our economy, and dictates to us an approach which means that essentially we have no choice. The choice is actually made by the situation. The situation makes our decision inevitable. We must go on working to shape an economic agreement for 1991, taking account of the emergency situation in the country.

The other approach, of which the comrades spoke at the Council of the Federation and also here in more or less condensed form, is when each will begin—on the basis of his own approaches and notions—to think about how to better his situation by his own efforts and by his own approach and means. Now, if that is the way, it means the collapse of the economy with all the consequences, social and political, and the collapse of the Union. At this congress, here, at this moment, that needs to be said. Because there is no choice. We have got to find a solution, and the solution must consist, precisely, in this: that we approach the formation of our economic agreement based on certain principles.

Those principles have not been artificially invented. The principles here consist precisely in this: that they are contained in the decisions that have been adopted, in particular those of the Supreme Soviet. This applies to taxes and others on the basis of which the plan and budget must be put together. Attempts to torpedo them, at the least, or overturn them—and this has been done, by the decisions of the official organs wherever they have taken place, and we're not only talking about individual republics—brings us back to the chaos in which we find ourselves and in which we can find ourselves if we go on with those approaches. So that must be said and made absolutely clear. The congress, for all the unpleasantness of this situation, you are reluctant, so to speak, but we must all, so to speak, clarity, take a stand here. [sentence as heard]

What, then, is a turnover tax? Leaving 100 percent as turnover tax from the enterprises situated in the Russian Federation. Comrade Nazarbayev showed this very well. The ultimate economic interest is realized precisely in the turnover tax. All those who—along this chain, from the raw material to this—have stayed with the ecology, with the unsolved range of problems as was done in Kemerovo and in all miners' towns, or metallurgical towns, how we acted then in those cases so that in the raw material branch or reconstruction they could be conducted or their infra-structure developed and so on, of the basic industries above all, that was where a mechanism was needed: a mechanism of redistribution, through a subvention, through central accumulations and so on—where to get them. [sentence as heard] That is what it is all about.

Then the comrades from those republics that are creating that base will submit that they must set prices that will provide them with a solution and income and make ends meet. But I must say that we shall, no doubt, in the next year and a half or two years or three, come closer to that approach. But now we cannot do it. The enterprises, not having any concluded contracts, already have violated, as it were, the flow of the material processes and that which ensures a base for the functioning of all industrial collectives. So from this come the results, from this the deduction of profits, and those 100 percent will turn out to be, for Russia too, not 100 percent, but something quite different. Here, Comrade Splokhov, as someone familiar with industry, I agree with you.

So if we now get drawn into debates, and start elucidating all those relations, we will lose two or three more months, and everything will be in ruins, and by then everyone will be on the street. In this there is no choice. We must decide. You can even limit yourselves to one point: Take cognizance of the report of the president on the progress of information. But I am talking to you about something else. You had to know how the processes in the Council of the Federation are going, where they have got to, in what they—what positions are being taken by whom and what—what we are confronting. From this situation I draw my own conclusions: I adhere to the view that we shall move on the path of shaping the

budget on the principles contained in the laws passed by the Union. No one has rescinded them or has the right to rescind them. And I shall act as president on that basis. Do not be surprised. That is how it will be. [applause]

Finance Minister Pavlov on Budget Problems

LD2712152190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Speech by USSR Finance Minister Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov to the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 27 December—recorded]

[Text] Dear congress, your work convincingly confirms the indisputable fact that the country, with all its diversity, has resolutely made a choice in favor of a transfer to market relations. This very complicated process is frequently painful and is linked to a break with old stereotypes in thinking, criteria in appraising values, and mechanisms for adopting decisions and assigning responsibility, that have taken shape over decades. Today this process has enveloped all spheres of work and all regions. Unfortunately however, the creation and mastering of the new is noticeably lagging behind, and is often accompanied by all manner of mistakes.

As you know, the rescue of all this has been the violation of economic ties, the lowering of the level of discipline and responsibility, resulting in a fall in production and consumption for purely subjective reasons in the development of production itself, instability, and an increase in tension in society. In order to avoid a further worsening of the situation, it has become urgently necessary to sign agreements to regulate economic ties and financial relations for the transitional period until a Union treaty is signed.

Today I have been instructed to report to the congress that work conducted on the instructions of the USSR president and the Council of the Federation has made it possible to reach accord on all questions that earlier had not been agreed on with regard to deliveries of foodstuffs, and to sign agreements with all Union republics, apart from an accord on the volume of deliveries of meat to the centralized fund from the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Work in that direction is continuing, and today it is extremely important to immediately start fulfilling these accords.

As for the overall agreement for 1991 to stabilize the social and economic situation in the country, today I can report that representatives of Union bodies and republics have agreed to complete work in the shortest possible time in order to conclude economic agreements between enterprises, irrespective of their location in the country. The intention is to preserve the ties that have taken shape, taking into account the necessary structural changes in the economy, and to ensure the free movement of output on goods, both between republics and inside the territories of the republics.

Agreements have been reached to use all resources at the disposal of the USSR president and leaders of highest bodies of power in the republics, in order to ensure deliveries, the fulfillment of work and services for common state aims, and interrepublican deliveries and agreements by all enterprises and organizations, irrespective of forms of ownership. The Union bodies of the republic, concerned over questions of cold winter weather, have recognized that deliveries of foodstuffs, fuel, and power to sociocultural establishments, and also for communal and everyday needs in the first quarter of 1991, should be provided first and foremost, and in every case they cannot be lower than last year's volumes.

The Union and the republics have also agreed to implement a coordinated policy in forming prices in order to insure equality of rights and free competition for those who produce goods throughout the USSR. We also agreed on issues regulating pay, employment, the migration of the population, and the establishment of minimum state guarantees in the social sphere. We have also agreed to work together on forming a foreign economic hard currency policy, and carrying out its decisions through a Union-republican hard currency committee. At the same time, it means that obtaining new loans, granting credits, and rendering economic assistance to foreign countries, as well as the conclusion of accords with regard to the receipt of such assistance from foreign sources on behalf of the USSR, will henceforth be carried out only following agreement with the republics.

The Union and the republics have also agreed to introduce new wholesale and purchase prices and tariffs in operation from 1 January 1991, in accordance with decisions made earlier, and proceed from the fact that enterprises and organizations formed these prices as the foundation of their plans for social and economic development, and to use them while concluding economic contracts for 1991. At the same time, the issue of financially guaranteeing the economic and social programs for 1991 has become the most complicated matter at the negotiations.

The acuteness of this issue is determined by the fact that the production of gross public product and national income is declining. In these conditions the Union and the republics agree that in order to insure an acceptable deficit of the USSR state budget and budgets of the Union republics, it is necessary to set up a special fund toward stabilisation and to introduce tax on sales. Such an approach shows that, in principle, even if account is taken of programs additionally adopted by the Union republics, the overall deficit of the country's state budget can be determined as being within the framework of 50-55 billion rubles, which is lower than this year's level.

At the same time, I have to tell you that while preparing this accord, we did not manage to achieve an agreement on one of the most fundamental issues: The issue of the distribution of income between the Union and the republics. As for the legislation, we did not succeed in reaching an accord today, first of all, with the Russian

Federation, which in its laws says that everything that is being sold on Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] territory belongs to the RSFSR. Hence, we cannot guarantee financial resources for Union programs, what we call programs and expenses for the functioning of the brain and the heart of our economy and its future, and of all our country. In these conditions of economic instability, we are unable to insure that salaries, pensions, and allowances according to those programs which are operating at the Union level are paid regularly.

We have suggested temporarily preserving the existing system for forming the income side as used throughout the world; in other words, participation of each governing body in producing a share of this income. Unfortunately, we have failed to reach an agreement. The absence of such an agreement practically means that tomorrow all the other Union republics should adopt the same time—taking into consideration that today, due to the prices redistribution processes on their territories, there is insufficient income—we could face a sharp price war in the nearest future.

Considering all this, we would like to continue negotiations with the Russian Federation and with the Baltic republics, on the basis of preserving those practical measures which we have adopted in accordance with the agreement with all other Union republics, at least until the Union treaty is signed.

Budget Chief Speaks in 'Sharp Debate'

LD2712190390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Remarks by Viktor Grigoryevich Kucherenko, chairman of the Commission for Planning and Budget, at the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies on 27 December in Moscow; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer Polozhentsov] A sharp debate began [in the Congress of People's Deputies] on the draft resolution of a provisional agreement on economic issues and the drawing up of the republics' budgets. A large number of deputies took part in the debates. I would like to mention the address by Kucherenko, chairman of the Commission for Planning and Budget, who reflected many deputies' views:

[Kucherenko] It is not a matter of whether to condemn some legislature's actions. This is not our function and we do not need to engage in this type of activity. It is not now necessary to cause the Union legislature to collide with the republics' legislatures. The issue is that if all this remains as it is, then there is no Union and all your standing ovations to the Union of Soviet Republics is in vain: There is no union. You must clearly understand that the fate of the Union is being decided now. If such a decision is made, so it will remain. Because on 1 January the entire Union budget—250 billion rubles—is not there. We do not have an army, we do not have administrative bodies, we have no science, and we do not have other sub-units which are connected with financing. This is understandable, and decisions must be taken where necessary. That is where the crux of the matter lies. One must not indulge in emotions here, comrades. I understand deputies' affiliation to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the Ukraine, the Baltic republics, and I understand national interests and economic interests.

But if we have voted here and have sworn solemnly that there is to be a union in the end, one must understand where we are going. This is the first point.

Second, Mikhail Sergeyevich, in the resolution you proposed, it can be seen that you will issue a decree on stabilization of funds. These are non-budget funds. Well, they have a bearing on the budget, but not much. What is at issue is the budget. Again, not a word is said about the budget in the resolution, apart from the fact that it says on 10 January the Supreme Soviet is to draw up the budget. On what basis will we draw it up? If the last sentence is to be understood correctly, that, in the end, you, and we, with our decision, adopt the policy that the Union laws which have been passed, on the basis of which the budgets have now been drawn up, comes finally and irrevocably into force prior to the adoption of the Union treaty, then yes. [sentence as heard] But we have already written in one of our decisions, when we examined your report at the congress—this position has already been enshrined there. For this reason I consider that the section which finally dots the "i"s and crosses the "t"s—how the budgets are to be drawn up prior to adoption, the signing of the Union treaty—must be expressed more precisely. If a decree is needed, then so be it. Without this we cannot get down to drawing up the budget. Well, after all, there is a budget. There are revenues. There are outgoings. This situation nonetheless is creating uncertainty. That is why we have impeded all work. That is why the question of the sources of drawing up the budget in this decision will, must be, precise, clear and definite: who, for whom, how much, which sources and where in our country the revenues of enterprises and organizations go.

[Polozhentsov] In connection with the fact that the passions surrounding this issue did not die down, the chairman proposed that the text of the resolution be duplicated and issued to the deputies so as to enable them to familiarize themselves with it in more detail, and after that adopt some decisions.

Congress Issues Appeal to 'Peoples of the Country'

LD2712235390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2131 GMT 27 Dec 90

["Appeal to the Peoples of the Country" read by Deputy Mikhail Aleksandrovich Ulyanov at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin, Moscow, on 27 December—recorded]

[Text] Here is the appeal to the peoples of the country:

Dear fellow countrymen, the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies wishes to address you, the citizens of the country. Having realized the degree of our responsibility, we—the USSR people's deputies—have done our best at this congress to provide for stabilization of the political and economic situation, to make a turn for the better, and to prevent the disintegration of the country. The congress has adopted a comprehensive solid program which encompasses the demands and hopes of Soviet people, their anxieties and worries. Without your active and conscientious support, without interaction between democratic power and the people, the congress decisions which are aimed at taking the country out of the crisis will remain meaningless words. We realize this and, therefore, we are insistently exhorting everyone to positive actions. We are calling everyone who is driven by a sense of realism and responsibility, and who is ready to rally together and work in the name of his home and his country, to civic concord and cooperation.

The time has come for us to hold out our hand to one another. It is precisely unity that has many times, at critical moments in history, come to the rescue of the peoples in this country. The difficulties will never disappear by themselves. Many tests lie ahead of us. But we authoritatively assert that conditions are arising for the situation to normalize. The congress decisions on strengthening executive power will form the structure of state administration which will ensure that laws are implemented without fail by all citizens of the country, by all organizations, establishments, and enterprises. Measures have been taken to create conditions for an attack to be launched upon crime, corruption, and the shadow economy. We are calling on you to continue along the difficult path of democratization. There is no alternative to this. When the absence of discipline and lawlessness are at the expense of safety and even people's lives, the state's very first obligation is to protect its citizens. What are coming to the fore today are questions of instituting a basic degree of order based on conscientious discipline so that everyone acquires confidence in the present day and in the future, sufficiency emerges, our children grow healthy, and people stop fearing for themselves and their relatives.

We have come out in favor of emergency measures to curb inflation and to saturate the market with goods, and in favor of tougher control and fair distribution of food resources.

Steps have been taken toward a market economy, which will encourage production on the basis of the personal interest of every worker. Everything necessary is being done to halt the process of disintegration of existing economic ties among the regions of the country and to ensure ecological safety. We are calling on the collectives of enterprises to rigorously fulfill their obligations under contracts and reciprocal deliveries. A halt in production must be prevented. That would threaten a national catastrophe.

We call for support to be given to the conclusion of a Union treaty for the sake of the preservation of our great state, which took many centuries to establish through the efforts of the peoples that inhabit it. In a renovated union, each republic will be able to realize its sovereignty on equal terms with others, and every person will be able to develop his potential as an individual. Life itself warns that if the country splits, this would bring with it the risk of a drop in the standard of living, an exacerbation of tension, unpredictable complications in relations with the outside world, and the undermining of the security of the state and all peoples.

We call on all who have found themselves drawn into interethnic conflicts to resolve their disputes in a good-neighborly fashion and not to add to the sum total of grief and tragedy, which is too great as it is. We call on the governments of the republics to actively cooperate with the leadership of the country on matters to do with complying with human rights and protecting the interests of all social and ethnic groups. We appeal to the country's soviets of people's deputies for cooperation. All of them, from settlement and rural level to republican and Union level, derive their powers from a single source. They are invested with rights by the same voters. That in itself implies cooperation, not discord.

We appeal to all political parties and public movements for constructive cooperation. In our view the congress has given an example of such an honest and creative dialogue between various forces. It should be continued and developed.

We appeal for support to you, our voters, and for your help in refraining from ill-considered political steps, strikes, and other actions which might destabilize the situation even more; for our help in organizing effective workers' control, which will close the way to sabotage and speculation; for your help and amicability toward other peoples and people of every nationality, religion and conviction; and for your help and trust in the USSR president and the country's corps of deputies, who reflect the divesity that really exists within society. We are varied, but united in one thing—the quest for the good of the country. We express the hope that you will energetically back the Soviet state's foreign policy which is directed at strengthening international security and creating favorable conditions for the continuation of economic and democratic transformations in the USSR.

Dear compatriots, we appeal to you on the eve of the new year of 1991. May it bring our homeland long-awaited tranquillity, well-being and happiness to each Soviet family.

Deputies Congress Adopts Bill on Referendum

LD2712113890 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The fourth Soviet Congress of People's Deputies today voted 1,565-53 with 57 abstensions to adopt a bill on a nationwide referendum.

For the first time over the years of Soviet Government, the law defines referendum as a way to implement state power by the people.

A referendum can be called either to adopt a new law, change a Soviet law already in force or annul it. It is envisaged that a referendum cannot be held to decide the question of the borders of the USSR, union and autonomous republics.

A referendum can be initiated by Soviet citizens, the Congress of People's Deputies, the country's parliament, its chambers, the Soviet president and the supreme bodies of legislative authority of a Union republic.

The law will enter into force from the moment of signature.

Congress Decision on Gulf Situation Reviewed

LD2712171490 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The USSR Congress of People's Deputies, supreme legislature in the USSR, expressed serious concern over dangerous developments in the Gulf.

A decision on this issue, adopted today, the last day of the congress's work, confirms "support for relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions which were adopted after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait".

The congress stressed its commitment to a peaceful solution of the crisis in compliance with these resolutions.

Legislators called on the Iraqi leadership and people "to display high responsibility for the destiny of their homeland and international peace and to fulfill demands of the international community based on the rules of civilised life and legality".

"Iraq must leave Kuwait, and that country's independence and sovereignty must be restored," the document states.

The decision approves the policy and moves by the Soviet leadership in connection with the Gulf crisis and measures to ensure the security and the return of Soviet citizens from Iraq to the USSR.

The congress spoke out "to continue consistent efforts to achieve a political settlement of the Gulf crisis."

Congress Confirms Procurator, Court Appointments

LD2712163590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1538 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)—The Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies today confirmed Nikolay Trubin in the post of USSR procurator general and Veniamin Yakovlev in the office of chairman of the Supreme Court of Appeal of the USSR. The decision on their appointments was earlier adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet following a proposal by the president.

The 59-year-old Nikolay Trubin, who has hitherto been procurator of the Russian Federation, stated today from the tribune of the congress that he considered the "defense of the people's rights and liberties" to be the priority field in the activity of the procuracy bodies.

The discussion of Trubin's candidature took only about 15 minutes, and the decision on the confirmation of the 58-year-old Veniamin Yakovlev, who previously occupied the post of USSR minister of justice, in the office of chairman of the Supreme Court of Appeal, was adopted without any discussion at all: Deputies already know the candidate well.

The congress also basically approved the draft law on the procedure for the recall of a USSR people's deputy and instructed the Supreme Soviet to redraft it, taking into account the remarks submitted, and adopt it in its final wording.

Congress Elects New Supreme Soviet Deputies

LD2712150190 Moscow TASS in English 1450 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The Fourth USSR Congress of People's Deputies elected 193 new members of the country's standing parliament today.

The rotation in the Supreme Soviet follows a secret ballot on candidates nominated by territorial deputies' groups. One fifth of the parliament is rotated annually under the Soviet Constitution.

A total of 206 deputies contested the 197 free seats in the 542- strong Soviet legislature. Most republics did not offer alternative candidates.

After the vote four seats in the Council of Nationalities (one of the chambers), allocated the Ukraine, Armenia, Lithuania and Estonia, remain vacant. Candidates from the first two republics failed to muster the necessary majority and Lithuania and Estonia did not nominate their representatives. All these seats are reserved for these republics.

TASS Reviews Congress' Final Day

LD2712164890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1623 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)—The Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies ended in Moscow today after 10 days of work.

The congress adopted amendments to the country's Constitution which transforms the Soviet system of executive power into a presidential system. Gennadiy Yanayev, 53-year-old secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has been elected to the post of vice president, which is new to the USSR.

The country's supreme legislative body approved the concept of a Union treaty which will become the legal base for a renewed Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The text of the treaty will be worked out at a preparatory committee consisting of the leaders of the country and of the republics and autonomies which are a part of it.

A decision on the situation in the country, which maps out a complex of measures for a way out of the difficult economic situation, was adopted.

The congress adopted a law on a referendum. The composition of the permanently operating Supreme Soviet of the country has been partially renewed.

In a decision on the situation in the Persian Gulf the congress came out in favor of the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and approved the Soviet leadership's political line and practical steps in connection with the crisis in the region.

An appeal to the citizens of the country was also adopted containing a call for the consolidation of all forces who are in favor of perestroyka.

PRAVDA Reports Deputies' 26 Dec News Conference

PM2712160790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 90 Second Edition p 3

[A. Petrushov report: "According to Conscience and Duty; Meeting at CPSU Central Committee Press Center"]

[Text] The last press conference this year for Soviet and foreign correspondents took place yesterday at the CPSU Central Committee Press Center (the Oktyabrskaya Hotel). The following participants in the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies came to meet the journalists: G. Yanayev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V. Grigoryev, first secretary of Vitebsk Belorussian Communist Party Obkom [Oblast Committee]; G. Kiselev, chairman of a USSR Supreme Soviet commission; and G. Shtoyk, secretary of East Kazakhstan Kazakh Communist Party Obkom. The meeting was devoted to the congress proceedings.

G. Yanayev noted that a very constructive dialogue was held at the congress on the pressing problems worrying society. Yanayev believes that the document adopted—"On the Situation in the Country and Urgent Measures to Overcome the Prevailing Socioeconomic and Political Crisis Situation"—provides a sound starting point for ensuring that order is imposed in the country in the next few months, broken national economic ties are restored, and the supply of food and everyday goods to the population is improved.

Concerning the congress resolution "On the General Concept of a New Union Treaty and the Procedure for Its Conclusion," he noted that economic interests are the very foundation which will enable the country's integrity to be preserved and our multinational state to be transformed into a voluntary equal union of sovereign republics. The signing of a new Union treaty is a most important factor in the normalization of the situation in the country and the consolidation of society.

G. Yanayev is the leader of the group of Communist USSR people's deputies. Answering a NOVOSTI question on the group's work, Gennadiy Ivanovich reported that his group now has 730 members, not all of whom are Communist deputies. The association came about on a unofficial basis. Its aim is to encourage the development of the standard of political thinking, to enhance the level of competence and the deputies' creative activeness in drafting legislation and exercising soviets' functions of power. These skills are all a normal part of legislative practice. Incidentally, all deputies belong to various groups. The Communists were the only group that was unorganized. Since its organization, the group is operating according to conscience and duty. In multiparty conditions, when the CPSU was faced with political opponents who were ready to physically harm Communists, the "let us live amicably" thesis looks laughable. We must master the art of political action more quickly.

Questions regarding USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's resignation were asked at the meeting. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said that a sensation should not be made out of this action because each man chooses the path he must walk. The USSR president has stated precisely and clearly that foreign policy will not change. G. Yanayev asked journalists to record his disagreement with Shevardnadze's assessment that a right-wing dictatorship is threatening the country. He refuted rumors that a Politburo meeting considered the question of the minister's resignation. He reiterated that the party leadership had nothing to do with Shevardnadze's resignation, which he put down to the "minister's tremendous workload."

Other participants in the meeting at the CPSU Central Committee Press Center also answered questions.

PRAVDA Publishes Constitutional Amendments Law

PM2712133390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[USSR Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law) in Connection with the Improvement of the System of State Management"]

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies **resolves:**

To make the following amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law):

1. Article 34 is to be supplemented with Part 3 to read as follows:

"Benefits to individual categories of citizens are established solely on the basis of the law. No one in the USSR may enjoy unlawful privileges."

2. In Part 1 of Article 77, the words "USSR Government" shall be replaced by the words "USSR Cabinet of Ministers."

3. The second sentence of Part 2 shall be deleted from Article 91.

4. In Part 4 of Article 96 the words "USSR Council of Ministers" shall be replaced by the words "USSR Cabinet of Ministers" and the words "and state arbiters" shall be deleted.

5. In Part 3 of Article 108:

Point 7 shall be deleted;

In Point 8 the words "Chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee" shall be deleted and the words "USSR Chief State Arbiter" shall be replaced by the words "Chairman of the USSR Supreme Arbitration Court";

Points 8, 9, 10, and 11 shall be renumbered Points 7, 8, 9, and 10 respectively.

6. In Article 113:

Points 2, 3, 4, and 18 are to be set forth as follows:

"2) at the proposal of the USSR president forms and abolishes USSR ministries and other central organs of state management of the USSR;

"3) On the submission of the USSR president confirms the prime minister, accepts or rejects at a session the candidacy of members of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and members of the USSR Security Council and agrees to the release of the aforementioned officials from their duties;

"4) elects the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR Supreme Arbitration Court, appoints the USSR General Prosecutor, ratifies the collegium of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, and appoints the chairman of the USSR Control Chamber";

"18) has the right to revoke acts of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers if they do not accord with the USSR Constitution and USSR laws";

the article is to be supplemented with a new point reading as follows, this being placed after Point 19;

"In the period between Congresses of USSR People's Deputies adopts the decision to hold a nationwide vote (referendum of the USSR)";

Point 20 shall be regarded as Point 21.

7. In Part 1 of Article 114, the words "the USSR Council of Ministers" shall be replaced by the words "Council of the Federation," the words "USSR Chief State Arbiter" shall be replaced by the words "USSR Supreme Arbitration Court," and the words "USSR People's Control Committee" shall be deleted.

8. Article 118 shall be supplemented by Point 4, to read as follows:

"Decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium shall be formulated as resolutions";

9. Part 2 of Article 121 shall be set out as follows:

"The appointment and election of officials to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR Supreme Arbitration Court, the USSR Prosecutor's Office Collegium, and also chairman of the USSR Control Chamber shall be conducted when the corresponding standing commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers or USSR Supreme Soviet committees have presented their conclusion."

10. In Article 122, the words "USSR Council of Ministers" shall be replaced by the words "USSR Cabinet of Ministers."

11. In Article 124:

In Point 4, the words "USSR Council of Ministers" shall be replaced by the words "USSR Cabinet of Ministers";

In Point 5, the words "USSR Council of Ministers," "USSR People's Control Committee," and "USSR Chief State Arbiter" shall be replaced by the words "USSR Cabinet of Ministers," "USSR Control Chamber," and "USSR Supreme Arbitration Court" respectively;

In Part 8 the words "or USSR Council of Ministers" shall be replaced by the words "to the USSR President, to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers".

12. Parts 2 and 3 of Article 125 shall be set forth as follows:

"The USSR Supreme Soviet directs the activity of the USSR Control Chamber and periodically hears its reports on the results of monitoring the receipt and expenditure of resources from the Union budget and of the use of all-Union property.

"The organization and operating procedure of the USSR Control Chamber shall be determined by USSR law".

13. In Article 127/3:

Point 4 is to be set forth as follows:

"4) heads the system of organs of state management and ensures their collaboration with the supreme organs of USSR state power";

Point 6 shall be regarded as Point 7, the words "Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers" and "chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee" shall be deleted, and the words "USSR Chief State Arbiter" shall be replaced by the words "Chairman of the USSR Supreme Arbitration Court."

Point 7 shall be regarded as Point 6 and set forth as follows:

"6) in the light of the opinion of the Federation Council and in coordination with the USSR Supreme Soviet, forms the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, makes changes to its composition, and presents to the USSR Supreme Soviet the nomination for the post of prime minister; and in coordination with the USSR Supreme Soviet relieves the prime minister and members of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers of their duties";

Point 9 shall be set forth as follows:

"9) entitled to revoke resolutions and ordinance of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, acts of USSR ministries and other organs subordinate to it; has the right on questions under USSR jurisdiction to suspend the execution of resolutions or ordinances of republics' Councils of Ministers in instances where they violate the USSR Constitution and USSR Laws";

To supplement the article with Point 9/1 as follows:

"9/1) heads the USSR Security Council, which is entrusted with elaborating recommendations on implementing all-Union policy in the sphere of the country's defense, maintaining its reliable state, economic, and ecological security, eliminating the aftermath of natural disasters and other emergency situations, and ensuring stability and law and order in society. The members of the USSR Security Council shall be appointed by the USSR president taking account of the Council of the Federation's opinion and in coordination with the USSR Supreme Soviet."

14. Article 127/4 shall be set forth as follows:

"Article 127/4. The candidate USSR president shall nominate a vice president of the USSR who shall be elected together with him. On the instructions of the USSR president the USSR vice president exercises certain of the president's powers and takes the USSR president's place when the latter is absent and unable to perform his own duties.

"The USSR vice president cannot be a people's deputy."

15. Articles 127/5, 127/6, and 127/9 shall be deleted.

16. Articles 127/7 and 127/8 shall be regarded as articles 127/5 and 127/6 respectively.

17. Article 127/10 shall be regarded as article 127/7 and the words "to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet" and "to the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers" in it shall be replaced by the words "to the vice president of the USSR" and "to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet" respectively.

18. The USSR Constitution is to be supplemented with a new Chapter 15/2 entitled "Council of the Federation" reading as follows:

"Chapter 15/2. Council of the Federation.

"Article 127/8. The USSR president heads the Council of the Federation, which shall include the USSR vice president and the presidents (supreme state officials) of the republics. The supreme state officials of the autonomous oblasts and autonomous okrugs are entitled to participate in sittings of the Council of the Federation with the right to a vote on questions affecting their interests.

"On the basis of USSR domestic and foreign policy guidelines laid down by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the Council of the Federation coordinates the activity of the supreme organs of state management of the Union and the republics, monitors the observance of the Union Treaty, determines measures to implement the Soviet state's nationalities policy, ensures the republics' participation in the solution of questions of all-Union significance, and adopts recommendations on the solution of disputes and the settlement of conflict situations in interethnic relations.

"Questions affecting the interests of peoples without their own national-state entities shall be examined at the Federation Council with the participation of those peoples' representatives.

"Article 127/9. A member of the Federation Council is the supreme state official of a republic representing and defending its sovereignty and legitimate interests and takes part in the solution of all questions submitted for the Federation Council's examination.

"A member of the Federation Council ensures the implementation of Federation Council decisions in the corresponding republic; monitors the execution of those decisions; receives all necessary information from union organs and officials; may protest decisions of union

organs of state management which infringe the legally-established rights of the republic; and on the instructions of the USSR president represents the USSR abroad and exercises other powers.

"Article 127/10. Decisions of the Federation Council are adopted by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the votes and are enacted by USSR presidential decrees.

"The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet may participate in sessions of the Federation Council."

19. The title of Chapter 16 is to be set forth as follows:

"Chapter 16. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers."

20. Article 128 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 128. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is the executive-administrative organ of the USSR and is subordinate to the USSR president."

21. Article 129 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 129. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers consists of the prime minister, his deputies, and ministers of the USSR.

"The structure of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is determined by the USSR Supreme Soviet at the suggestion of the USSR president.

"Heads of the republic governments may participate in the work of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers with the right to vote."

22. Article 130 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 130. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is responsible to the USSR president and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"The newly formed USSR Cabinet of Ministers submits a program of upcoming activity for the duration of its powers to the USSR Supreme Soviet for examination.

"At least once a year the USSR Cabinet of Ministers reports back to the USSR Supreme Soviet on its work.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet may pass a vote of no confidence in the USSR Cabinet of Ministers—which entails its resignation. A resolution on this question is adopted by a majority of votes from at least two-thirds of the total number of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

23. Article 131 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 131. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is competent to resolve questions of state management under the USSR's jurisdiction, since, according to the USSR Constitution, they do not fall within the competence of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Council of the Federation."

24. Article 132 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 132. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers ensures:

"the implementation, jointly with the republics, of a unified financial, credit, and monetary policy based on a common currency; the compilation and implementation of the Union budget; the implementation of all-Union economic programs; the creation of interrepublican development funds and funds for the elimination of the aftermath of natural disasters and catastrophes;

"the management, jointly with the republics, of the country's unified fuel and energy system and transportation system; the management of defense enterprises, space research, and the Union communications, information, meteorological, geodetic, cartographic, geological, metrological, and standardization systems; the implementation of a concerted policy in the sphere of nature conservation, ecological safety, and use of natural resources;

"the implementation, jointly with the republics, of all-Union programs for food, health protection, social security, the population's employment, care for mother and child, culture and education, basic scientific research, and the encouragement of scientific and technical progress;

"the adoption of measures to ensure the country's defense and state security;

"the realization of USSR foreign policy, the regulation of the USSR's foreign economic activity, the coordination of the republics' foreign policy and foreign economic activity, and customs matters;

"the implementation of measures agreed with the republics to ensure legality and citizens' rights and freedoms, to protect property and public order, and to fight crime."

25. Article 133 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 133. On the basis of and in execution of USSR laws and other decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR presidential decrees, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers promulgates resolutions and ordinances and verifies their execution. Resolutions and ordinances of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers are mandatory for execution throughout the USSR's territory."

26. Article 134 is to be deleted.

27. Article 135 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 135. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers unites and directs the work of USSR ministries and other organs subordinate to it.

"Collegiums, which include, ex officio, the leaders of the republics' corresponding organs, are created in ministries and other central organs of USSR state management to coordinate the resolution of questions of state management."

28. Article 136 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 136. The competence of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, its operating procedure, relations with other

state organs, and also the list of ministries and other central organs of USSR state management are defined in USSR law."

29. In Article 140 the words "resolutions and ordinances of the USSR Council of Ministers" are to be replaced by the words "acts of the USSR president and of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers."

30. Article 145 is to be supplemented by a second part to read as follows:

"In the system of local self-management organs of territorial public self-management, citizens' assemblies, and other forms of direct democracy may operate in addition to local soviets of people's deputies, in accordance with the republics' legislation."

31. Article 149 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 149. The executive and administrative organs of local soviets of people's deputies are the executive committees or other organs elected by the local soviets of people's deputies.

"At least once a year the executive and administrative organs of local soviets report back to the soviets which elected them, as well as at meetings of labor collectives and at citizens' places of residence."

32. Article 150 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 150. The executive and administrative organs of local soviets of people's deputies are obliged to fulfill the laws, USSR presidential decrees, and other acts of the supreme organs of state power and management in the USSR and the republics adopted within the bounds of their competence.

"The executive and administrative organs of local soviets are directly subordinate both to the soviet which elected them and to the higher executive and administrative organ."

33. The title of Section VII is to be set forth as follows: "VII. Justice and Prosecutor's Office Supervision."

34. The title of Chapter 20 is to be set forth as follows: "Chapter 20. The Courts."

35. Part 7 of Article 152 is to be set forth as follows: "Judges and people's assessors may be recalled as laid down in law."

36. Article 163 is to be set forth as follows:

"Article 163. Economic disputes in the USSR are resolved by the USSR Supreme Court of Arbitration and by the organs created in the republics in accordance with their laws for the resolution of economic disputes.

"No organs, organizations, or officials are permitted to interfere in judges' activities in resolving disputes.

"The organization and operating procedure of the USSR Supreme Court of Arbitration are defined in USSR law."

37. Articles 164, 166, 167, and 168 are to be set forth as follows:

"Article 164. The precise and uniform execution of USSR laws by all ministries and other organs of state management, enterprises, establishments, organizations, local soviets of people's deputies, their executive and administrative organs, political parties, public organizations and mass movements, officials, and also citizens is supervised by the USSR general prosecutor, the Union republic prosecutors, and the prosecutors subordinate to them."

"Article 168. Republic prosecutors are appointed by the republics' supreme organs of state power in agreement with the USSR general prosecutor and are subordinate to them. In their activity in supervising the execution of USSR laws the republic prosecutors are also subordinate to the USSR general prosecutor.

"Article 167. The USSR general prosecutor is empowered for a period of five years.

"Article 168. Prosecutor's office organs exercise their powers independently of all local organs.

"The organization and operating procedure of prosecutor's office organs are defined in USSR and Union republic legislation."

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR.
The Kremlin, Moscow, 26 December 1990.

Amendments Enabling Law Published

PM2712141590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

["USSR Law: On the Enactment of the USSR Law 'On Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law) in Connection With the Improvement of the System of State Management'"]

[Text] USSR Law: On the Enactment of the USSR Law "On Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law) in Connection with the Improvement of the System of State Management."

The Congress of USSR People's Deputies **resolves**:

Article 1. To enact the USSR Law "On Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law) in Connection with the Improvement of the System of State Management" from the moment of its adoption.

Article 2. The USSR Council of Ministers and other state organs and officials accountable to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet retain their powers until the formation of state organs and the appointment of officials in accordance with the aforementioned law.

Article 3. To establish that on the first occasion the USSR vice president is to be elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies for the remainder of the term of

the first president of the USSR. The candidate who receives more than one-half of the votes of the total number of USSR people's deputies shall be deemed elected.

Article 4. To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to elaborate and adopt legislative acts regulating the organization, powers, and operating procedure of the Federation Council, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the USSR Control Chamber, and the USSR Supreme Arbitration Court, and also to make the corresponding amendments and additions to the Standing Orders of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

To instruct the USSR president to ratify the USSR Security Council Regulations.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR.
The Kremlin, Moscow. 26 December 1990.

Kalmykov Interviewed on Referendum Law

PM27121534490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Dec 90 Second Edition pp 1, 3

["Lightning Interview" with Yuriy Kalmykov, chairman of a USSR Supreme Soviet committee, by G. Ovcharenko—date, place not given; first paragraph is Ovcharenko introduction: "Yuriy Kalmykov: 'Referendums Are the Mainstay of Democracy'"]

[Text] At the congress recently Yuriy Khamzatovich Kalmykov, as chairman of a committee of the country's Supreme Soviet, presented a draft USSR law on a nationwide vote (a USSR referendum). On the same day deputies adopted it in its entirety. Literally on the following day, some deputies, who in their election campaigns had championed the cause of developing democracy, suddenly began saying that we have no need of referendums: In present circumstances, they say, they will not reveal the people's true opinion. What had happened? I asked Yu. Kalmykov about this.

[Ovcharenko] But first, Yuriy Khamzatovich, I would like to know in more detail about the referendum system itself; for instance, when did it originate?

[Kalmykov] Let us begin by saying that, academically, democracy is divided into direct and representative democracy. The former originated a long time ago, back in the times of the Roman republic, and referendums were held back then. Referendums were no novelty as a form of direct democracy in Kievan Russia either, when important decisions were taken by direct vote in Novgorod, Pskov, and other Russian cities. As a legal institution, however, the referendum was formalized only in the middle ages—a referendum was officially held for the first time in Switzerland in 1449 to determine the financial situation. Since then nationwide votes on especially important questions have been held in many countries.

[Ovcharenko] But all the same, as far as is known, the attitude to referendums is not universally unambiguous. For example, this legal institution is little used in the countries of Asia and Africa...

[Kalmykov] What is more, the referendum is not considered to be the most perfect form of democracy everywhere or by everyone in Europe or America either. There is an opinion that the most perfect form is a parliamentary system which is finely tuned, divided into chambers, committees, and commissions composed of highly qualified people. It is these people, according to this opinion, who are able to adopt the only correct and beneficial decision. In the majority of countries it is nonetheless customary to believe that a referendum is the mainstay of democracy. In the legislation of a number of countries a specific range of questions that are decided by referendums is plainly stipulated.

[Ovcharenko] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies has resolved to submit two questions to nationwide discussion—the question of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and that of private ownership of land. Voices are already being heard saying that these referendums are not necessary. They say that the aforementioned land question should be decided by the peasants alone...

[Kalmykov] Such an approach is, in my view, fundamentally incorrect. The land is the main capital asset of the state and the people. It is written into the foundations of our legislation that land cannot be sold. It can be transferred into lifelong, inheritable tenure or a leasehold, but it cannot be subject to buying and selling. It is not just the peasant who is interested in the land, but also every worker, scientist, and pensioner—every citizen of the country. If we begin selling land, there is a colossal danger that it will pass into the possession of people who possess huge amounts of money today already. It is no secret: There is a sharp differentiation of people according to income in our country today—some people have millions whilst others struggle from pay packet to advance. I repeat once again: The question of private ownership of land concerns every one of us. After all, it is not just agricultural holdings that are situated on the land, but also plants, institutions, schools, ministries, kindergartens, and your editorial offices. Therefore, in my view, it is fair to submit this question to a nationwide vote.

[Ovcharenko] And the other question—about the USSR?

[Kalmykov] I have no doubts here either. What the Union should be is above all the people's concern, and it is for them to decide this question.

[Ovcharenko] But bear in mind that the new leaders of a number of republics, campaigning for their secession from the Union, are not holding republic referendums on this issue...

[Kalmykov] Yes, and they are doing so deliberately, because they understand that by no means does the

entire population of their republics support their separatist aspirations. This is a widespread practice today, by the way—to pass off personal desires and ambitions as the people's opinion. No, let the people vote themselves for what they want.

[Ovcharenko] Suppose the population of a republic votes in the nationwide vote for secession from the Union. What then?

[Kalmykov] I think here that we should proceed on the basis of the total number of people voting on the territory of the USSR. Each republic is not taken separately, because it is a Union referendum. Incidentally, that is my opinion. The congress has yet to voice its opinion on this issue. Especially because, as has already been said, a referendum on secession from the Union may be held in a republic too. As you can see, however, they aren't in a hurry over this even in the Baltic region. I still think that the results of the Union referendum should be based on the total number of people voting on the territory of the country.

[Ovcharenko] What is the mechanism for holding referendums?

[Kalmykov] Let us remember that a referendum is a vote. For this reason we have laid down in the law on referendums that it is to be carried out based on the elections law, with the exception of the peculiar features relating to referendums. Three types of commission are to be formed—the central, republic, and precinct referendum commissions. They will monitor the observation of legality in the voting process.

[Ovcharenko] On whose initiative can a referendum be held?

[Kalmykov] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers, and the republics in the shape of their top organs of state power possess this right. A group of citizens (of not less than 100 people) can also take this initiative, if it musters not less than 2 million signatures in support of its proposal within a three-month period.

Deputy on Call for Debate on Troops in Gulf

PM2412123590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed interview with USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Engver; place and date not given: "Deputy Nikolay Engver"]

[Text] He is 42, a Latvian by nationality, and a doctor of economic sciences. He lives in Izhevsk. He works actively in the USSR Supreme Soviet. On 20 December legislative journalists noticed that "there was no room" for him in the traditional morning debate. Nikolay Nikolayevich angrily walked out. Why?

[Engver] During "any other business" yesterday Pavel Shetko, chairman of the Committee for Internationalist Servicemen's Affairs, made a statement on behalf of Afghan war veteran deputies and his committee—and I work on this legislative organ. The crux of the statement was as follows. We do not want a repeat of the way the decision to send troops into Afghanistan was made in the context of the Persian Gulf.

There were around 40 signatures on the statement. The signatories included highly respected Afghan veterans—Ruslan Aushev, Rizo Odzhiyev, Sergey Chervonopiskiy....

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] But the statement was read out....

[Engver] The evaluation part of this statement was cut from the television reportage from the congress. I wanted to submit a protest. You realize that since the first congress we have been insisting (and this has been stated at all Supreme Soviet sessions) on a comprehensive evaluation of the Afghan war. Not only an assessment of the decision to send in troops but an assessment of the entire war.... But we cannot get this.

So. The evaluation part of our statement pointed out that the introduction of the troops was a crime against the Soviet and Afghan peoples. A crime committed by the country's political leadership.

Today it can all be blamed on the fact that at the time we were living under stagnation. But our deputies will not have such an excuse. If "black tulips" [black-painted aircraft bringing back bodies on secret night flights] start coming into the country again, only from the Persian Gulf area this time, people will rightly ask: We have glasnost, do we not, and a democratically operating legislature? Meaning: You do not have the courage, you simply chickened out and did not state your position.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] As I understand it, you are demanding that this question be decided by the current congress.

[Engver] We put the question as follows: The congress must vote for two proposals, and Pavel read them out from the rostrum.

The first proposal. Not to dissolve the Supreme Soviet for the vacations until the problem of using our troops is finally resolved. That is, such a decision must not be made without a discussion in legislature.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Sorry for interrupting. Is such a thing possible, then?

[Engver] The constitution could allow such a "loophole." Might we suddenly find that there are some kind of secret protocols? I cannot guarantee there are not any. Let us imagine. The legislature goes into recess for the vacations. The peace pause between the opposing sides in the Persian Gulf zone expires 15 January. What happens then?

But let me say at the same time: We are capable of understanding both the Soviet people's interests and the interests of mankind and the world community that any aggression must be punished. Nobody can be allowed to enjoy the fruits of aggression— Saddam Husayn in this specific instance. But no action must be taken without a discussion in the Supreme Soviet.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Apart from our regrettable Afghan experience, is your statement linked with anything else?

[Engver] What do you mean? Let us try to imagine the state of those who are currently being drafted into the Army.... Every mother has a heavy heart: Will troops suddenly be sent to the Arabian peninsula? This is the reality. It is our direct duty, as we have been elected, to protect these people's interests. At least they need to know that deputies express these interests.

We believe that the time has now come to state our position on this question legislatively—this is the second proposal made in the committee's statement—and make specific amendments to the USSR Constitution and laws on the use of the Armed Forces outside the borders of the Union's territory. It transpires that at present there are no democratically adopted decisions on this problem. Since we are a legislative organ, we have a direct obligation to prepare such decisions.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Are you going to work to achieve this?

[Engver] We will achieve it.

Political & Social

Deputies React to Shevardnadze Resignation

91UN0565A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies: "The Deputies' Opinion"]

[Text]**E.A. Shevardnadze's statement of resignation was so unexpected that at the next session an hour was set aside exclusively for discussion of this unusual situation. Here are some points of view that have been offered from the podium of the congress:**

Academician Dmitriy Likhachev:

On behalf of some of the delegates and of myself I would like to express deepest sorrow and concern in regard to this situation. We ask Eduard Amvrosiyevich to suspend his decision.

Colonel Victor Alksnis:

I would like you to understand: When it is said that the military is grabbing for power, I say no, the military is not grabbing for power. I personally was called to the Minister of Defense, Marshal of the Soviet Union Yazov, who both pleaded with me and ordered me to change my position because I am compromising the Army. But I believe that I am not compromising the Army; I am expressing my position as a deputy.

Yes, I support the resignation of Minister of Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze. But not because I am against the current foreign policy, no. I know we have to leave Eastern Europe, but I am against the way it is being done. ...It was Shevardnadze who signed this timetable for the troop withdrawal.

We are told, and he assures us, that he does not want to send troops to the Middle East. But why does he make two statements in New York? At first he says that it is possible that we will send troops to the Middle East; then, two months later, he says that, yes, the Supreme Soviet had vetoed a deployment of troops, but only if it creates a danger for the Soviet people. Does the USSR president have the right to send troops over the head of the Supreme Soviet?

Writer Sergey Zalygin

I cannot agree with my friend Ales Adamovich in turning the issue that way. Why? ...We are discussing Shevardnadze's statement. ...I propose that we vote on the wisest and the shortest proposal put forward by Academician Likhachev.

Deputy Gdlyan: Others To Follow

LD2712152590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1255 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Remarks by Telman Gdlyan, USSR people's deputy from Tushina Territorial Constituency No 25, during an interview with correspondent Andrey Zemkov; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] The departure of these two ministers, Shevardnadze and Bakatin, is no surprise. You forgot that before that another minister, if that is what he can be called, left—the substandard Prosecutor General of the USSR, Sukharev. He was simply cast aside because he had compromised himself too much in the eyes of public opinion, he had done all that dirty work on the Uzbek-Moscow-Kremlin affairs, and when he was not longer needed and he had become a monster in the eyes of public opinion, the supreme leadership—led by Gorbachev—decided to get rid of him because he could no longer stay on the team, because he had become too odious to the people.

I think Shevardnadze most likely—there is another version too—most likely wanted to save face for himself, the face of a statesman and politician, and cease to be implicated in the adventures being conducted in the Kremlin today.

But after him, you see, others will go too, only not from shame, decency, or on principle, but they will be sacrificed because they too have become too odious. In this category I see first of all Kryuchkov, chief of the political

police, and after him, naturally, the marshal of the Soviet Union, that same Minister of Defense Yazov. They will be thrown out too, because their activity has become criminal, especially in the area of bloodshed in many regions of the country where they have essentially become accomplices in the crimes.

It must therefore be said that the ship is sinking, not that bits of the ship are disintegrating, the whole ship is disintegrating and you know who are scattering. [passage omitted]

The most dangerous thing I can see here is that the wild right-wing reactionary forces may, as they lose their positions and lose their cliquish interests and privileges, embark on an adventure. They may try using force and unleash civil war. The monstrous danger is not at the threshold but in our house. If the democratic forces cannot now unite into a single block and reply to the rightist reactionary forces then the unleashing of bloodshed is inevitable.

And the main thing I managed to say was this—although they tried to stop me with foot stamping, cat-calls, and clapping, and the congress does not listen because it is full of our clients in corruption and they set the tone, they did not want to listen to me—I wanted to appeal through the congress to our Soviet people and I wanted these three points to be heard clearly;

1. To outlaw the participants in a coup d'etat;

2. From the moment of the establishment of a dictatorship in the Soviet Union to call the people to a general political open-ended strike. And;

3. To call on the countries of the West, from the moment of the appearance of a junta in our country, to declare a general blockade.

Recently that same chief of political police Kryuchkov, chairman of the KGB, in an attempt to intimidate public opinion with counter-revolutionary attacks on our system, cited many delirious examples, for example: That our press is engaged in anti-state activity, foreign intelligence, foreign voices, the People's Labor Union [NTS], whatever; but the most colorful example was that a certain people's deputy had expressed himself thusly: Down with the puppet USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Congress of People's Deputies. But in setting me at loggerheads with the congress he did not realize that beyond the wall of the Kremlin where the everyday human life of 300 million Soviet people driven to such a absurd conditions continues, he did not realize that the absolute majority of these people certainly agreed with the appeal which I... [fades out to music]

Possible Successors

LD2712170290 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS World Service diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—Yesterday morning foreign correspondents in Moscow began indicating Gennadiy Yanayev as Shevardnadze's possible successor. He and Yevgeniy Primakov were believed the most probable heirs of the ex-foreign minister, who remains in office.

Other candidates are now being discussed. They include Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, former First Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, now ambassador to Washington, and also Aleksandr Dzasokhov, member of the Soviet Communist Party Politburo, responsible for ideology. Dzasokhov is also chairman of the International Affairs Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Of course, Shevardnadze is still in office and no one knows how long he will remain. People close to the minister say that Shevardnadze's voluntary resignation is "final" and that the minister will leave, but it is unknown whether this will happen before or after President Bush's visit to the USSR.

Nevertheless, while political observers in Moscow still ask: "Why did all this happen?" The minister's closest entourage is keeping mum. His assistants and senior colleagues refuse to discuss the subject.

Commenting on the current view that Shevardnadze's step is due to the fact that he has allegedly completed his "cycle" on the international arena, one senior diplomat noted sarcastically: "The foreign minister is not a moon to adhere to 'cycles'. He implements the country's foreign policy, which reflects the country's internal political processes."

Another diplomat was even more precise: "Even some concrete programmes have not been completed yet. The treaty on strategic offensive weapons has not been signed. The efforts to build a common European home, even though marked by such major accomplishments as the unification of Germany and the Paris CSCE conference, is continuing and we are heading towards Helsinki-2. Interesting areas of Soviet-American interaction have appeared on the international arena and in bilateral relations, including economy. The world is also waiting for the Gulf crisis to be settled and Shevardnadze's stand on this issue deserves respect for its principledness and consistency, its categoric denunciation of aggression."

Local observers are also intrigued by the way Shevardnadze tendered his resignation. His decision to announce it from the rostrum of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, without consulting the president, is proof that totalitarian, backstage methods of forming governing bodies are gradually dying off within top Soviet echelons. "I would like to believe," one eminent political analyst said, "that Shevardnadze's statement, addressed directly to the congress and public opinion at large, is a fresh sprout of the new law-abiding democratic society emerging in the USSR."

Will Shevardnadze really step down? I think it is premature to make such predictions.

Primakov, for instance, has denied rumours that he will be appointed as foreign minister. However, it is not ruled out that he will get another important job, for instance, as presidential assistant in the USSR Security Council.

Observers also doubt that a high-ranking Foreign Ministry official, such as Petrovskiy or Bessmertnykh, could replace Shevardnadze, despite their very high rating among Soviet diplomats. Perhaps, their main "drawback" as candidates to the post of foreign minister is that they have never held high party posts. Dzasokhov appears to have better chances. He has held important party posts in the center and elsewhere, he is an experienced diplomat and heads the parliamentary International Relations Committee.

It remains to be seen whether Shevardnadze's resignation will be accepted by the president and parliament. Proceeding from the current international and domestic situation, I believe he may remain in office indefinitely.

TASS Observer on Yanayev as Vice President

LD2812104890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0630 GMT 28 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative observer Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Dec (TASS)—So the choice has been made—albeit at the second attempt, Mikhail Gorbachev's candidate for the post of vice president, Gennadiy Yanayev, was elected yesterday just before the end of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Analysts are now racking their brains, trying to find a rational explanation for the Soviet leader's latest move. I too will venture a contribution to the discussion of the reasons prompting the USSR's first president to select Gennadiy Yanayev.

I must, first of all, agree that the president's move, totally unexpected as usual, appers to be not entirely logical—and not just because it will probably give rise to dissatisfaction among the "democrats" and will hardly be accepted by "the public at large," which had expected to see a figure of much greater caliber in that post, such as Aleksandr Yakovlev or Eduard Shevardnadze.

More important, it seems to me, is the very fact that the appointment of yet another Russian to the second most significant post in a seething multinational state will give rise to vague muttering in the republics, and will generate problems akin to those that are so familiar to the United States, for example. And that is particularly dangerous now, when intensive talks are being conducted about a renewal of the Soviet federation.

The nomination of Gennadiy Yanayev, yet another representative of the highest party apparat, is likely to be viewed negatively by the West, too, as a manifest step to the right. The president's choice shifts him into the camp of the right-wingers, making him, to some extent, their hostage. It may be expected that the "right-wingers" will now wish to develop their tactical advantage and will try to compromise Gorbachev through the adoption of some hard-line decision, for example, in Moldavia or the Baltic area. Finally, there is the danger that Mikhail Gorbachev's new move, while strengthening his hand in the center, will, at the same time, strengthen the Yeltsin-Nazarbayev-Kravchuk (Russia-Kazakhstan-Ukraine) "entente" that is taking shape and aspiring to create "a union within the union."

It is possible, following the refusal of Nursultan Nazarbayev to stand for the post of vice president, and the unexpected resignation of Eduard Shevardnadze, that Mikhail Gorbachev, pressed for time, simply had no tailor-make candidate to field. The compromise choice does at least enable him to count on the personal loyalty of Gennadiy Yanayev.

Admittedly, the "democrats" are not blameless either: Despite all their starry-eyed impulses, they have proved to be incapable of providing reliable left-of-center support for Gorbachev. And since the appearance on the political stage of Boris Yeltsin, who has chosen a left-wing (and sometimes even ultra-left) course and who, like the "left-wingers," relies on the support of the popular masses, the latter have, in general, started to evoke the president's distrust.

May one consider, as many do, that the congress has been a triumph for the "right-wingers"? I think not. At the most, I would say that "a battle has been lost, but not the war." To understand the course that the ship of perestroyka will follow from now on, I think that several factors should be considered. Firstly, there is the personal destiny of Yakovlev, Shevardnadze and, to some extent, Bakatin. There is the formation of a new cabinet of ministers, its structure, and the demarcation of powers with the republics. There is the unblocking of relations with the republics and the concluding of an economic agreement with them for 1991, including the settlement of plan and budget problems. There is the development of the situation in Moldova and the Baltic area. Now that Mikhail Gorbachev has received all conceivable powers, it will be extremely hard for him to back off from solving these problems. Finally, there is the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit, by that time the smoke of battle ought to have dispersed once and for all, and the West's attitude toward what has happened should have become defined. It will then be possible to draw definite conclusions.

Afanasyev Warns Against Dictatorship

PM2812141690 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 21 Dec 90 p 1 (MAGASIN section)

[Article by USSR People's Congress Deputy Yuriy Afanasyev; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "When The Russian People Wake"]

[Text] Gorbachev is moving toward a new dictatorship in the Soviet Union. That is the dramatic accusation made by historian Yuriy Afanasyev in this analysis, whose conclusions are being published simultaneously by BERLINGSKE TIDENDE and the Soviet newspaper, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA.

This fall our economy entered on a new era, and as a result the political outlook has grown a little less gloomy. For the first time since 1985 there is a concrete, realistic, and forward-looking plan able to extricate us from our growing problems—that is, the Shatalin plan—and it is of course open to discussion, but that does make it possible to take radical steps, and not only within the economy.

The agreement between Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin is excellent. It bears witness to an understanding between central authority and the republics, particularly the Russian Republic. Without this agreement we would be unable to make any progress. This dialogue could perhaps be seen as the first step toward a center-left coalition—something that is very important, because the symbolic value of the seeds of an alliance between the center and the left is a prerequisite for resolving our enormous problems. It is also a weapon against chaos and the temptations of authoritarian rule.

But these glimmers of hope lighting up the political horizon have been overshadowed by a new threat of conflict caused by the president himself. The decisions he reached in late November and those he has made in the present month of December can only be seen as a step towards setting up a dictatorship.

September and October witnessed an abrupt change of political course. My explanation of this is that Mikhail Gorbachev was subjected to very great pressure. There is indirect evidence of this: The coalition of conservative and reactionary forces—that is, the forces of the party apparatus, the KGB, the military-industrial complex, and the combined forces of the officers' corps—was strengthened.

It is quite clear that there were troop movements. The generals' irresolution in the Supreme Soviet, when there was a risk that the Army would be depoliticized, has been replaced by great resolve in the statements of the military elite.

In a speech Colonel Viktor Alksnis has expressed the suspicion that nationalist movements in five sovereign republics are more or less controlled by the CIA. The Communist Party in the Russian Republic has made several declarations in the same spirit. Everything confirms growing resistance on the part of these political forces to the transition to a market economy.

The lack of coherence in the government's program—that people first overlooked—has become glaringly obvious, now that the government has tried three times to put it before the Supreme Soviet. In a civilized society this would have meant the government's resignation. But why will not or cannot the president see this, although it is clear to everyone?

I see at least two reasons for this "backlash," which is hitting us at the worst hour of the crisis. The first reason: If the present government resigned it would be impossible to form another government in accordance with the constitution, since the Supreme Soviet cannot do so. Under such circumstances we must agree to take steps which run contrary to the constitution and form a cabinet or a committee directly under the president.

This would inevitably raise the question of the very existence of the Supreme Soviet (for such a body is meaningless if it cannot form a government) and also that of the Congress of People's Deputies and of the president.

There is also another, and undoubtedly more important, reason. If a new government or a new cabinet under the president is formed to carry through the economic reforms, it must dissociate itself from the mistakes that have been made in the first five years of perestroyka, if only to distance itself from the past unfortunate period.

The mistakes and the actual shipwreck that we are now witnessing have still not been renounced, and masses of figures are still being kept hidden. The information that is most vital to society is still being kept secret.

We know that our gold and diamond reserves have been wasted. But on what scale? The complaints Boris Yeltsin raised with the president have still not been supported by solid information. We know that there are political regimes such as those of Iraq, Cuba, and Angola. But how have they been able to stay in power, and what has been done over the last five years to lend them material support?

These questions, along with many others, await an answer. The example of Eastern Europe shows that today the peoples are calling to account those responsible for the catastrophic situation in which these countries find themselves. I do not want bloodshed, and I do not want to create victims of new persecutions.

It is important to remember that when the masses regain consciousness they can resort to extreme actions, and they can just as easily be dangerous to those in power as to society. It seems to me that our government panics at the thought of appearing before the people's court, allowing full light to be shed on the results of the last five years.

A new executive power could in truth disclose all of this, and the possibility cannot be ruled out that there will rise a wave of anger that neither Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov nor Mikhail Gorbachev can withstand. This is another reason why Mikhail Gorbachev, despite the obvious weakening of the government, has defended it warmly and subsequently proposed a reform that aims

not at radical renewal but at the transfer of power from the control of the Congress of People's Deputies to the control of the president.

In our country the executive authorities are not elected. The Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies do not reflect the current mood of society (which has changed greatly over the last two years). There are no precise demarcation lines between the functions of the government, the president, and the presidency of the Supreme Soviet. There is no order of rank between the various executive power groups. That is why the president's decisions are often inadequate. Practically all the president's decrees to date have been reached at the expense of the government.

To be brief: Inadequate decisions are being reached at all levels, and this is leading to the paralysis of executive authority and to chaos. The poor functioning of the structures of society is throwing us into free fall and growing disorganization, and destructive forces are being strengthened day by day.

Society is unable to move forward with the current power structures, and this is just as worrying as the president's mistakes and lack of resolve. This, particularly at a time when the task is to transform the very heart of one of society's central elements—the economy.

To overcome this stagnation we must first and foremost create legally viable organs. If we do not set up concrete mechanisms and do not set precise time scales we will meet our own destruction. It has become necessary for us to suspend our constitution and prepare a new one, and to create a coordination committee between the republics.

Executive power at the union level cannot continue to act as it has done hitherto. Let us be clear about this: The government is no longer necessary. On the other hand a flexible strategic organ is indispensable. Its name is of no importance: It could be a center or a committee for an alliance strategy, or for the creation of a strategy for horizontal ties, or perhaps a committee for coordination between the republics.

At any rate this scheme will have to be self-renewing. Such a mechanism could actually form the foundation for other more optimistic developments—namely, the formation of a national coalition government.

Ryzhkov's Wife Interviewed

LD2712154290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1453 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec TASS—Nikolay Ryzhkov's wife today agreed to answer a TASS correspondent's questions on the state of health of the Soviet head of government. Lyudmila Ryzhkova, who yesterday "categorically"—in her own word—refused to meet journalists agreed to give a telephone interview "in order to dispel the rumors and conjectures" that have surrounded the health of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. She described Nikolay Ryzhkov's heart attack.

Nikolay Ryzhkov's wife said that on 25 December "he came home at midnight. That day he had taken part in the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and from 1900 to 2300 in a session of the Council of the Federation, at which, in his words, 'there were disputes and clashes', certain leaders, for example, of Russia, refused to take part in it at all". Then, after holding a 40-minute conference with his deputies, Nikolay returned home.

"Nikolay Ivanovich looked pale, and when I asked him how he felt he said he was very tired. We went to bed at 0130, but at 0300 he woke me and asked for something for his heart. He was very pale and had a cold sweat. He told me he couldn't sleep".

"I gave him some validol and immediately called the doctor who took a cardiogram and immediately called an ambulance, which took him to hospital. It was about 0400".

The next day the doctors at the hospital told Lyudmila Ryzhkova that her husband had suffered a heart attack. "Admiring his courage, they said that on the way to the hospital, despite the pain, he even tried to joke with and support the doctors". It turned out that he felt the first pains on 25 December, but he said nothing either to his wife or the doctors, hoping "that it would all pass".

Asked how Nikolay Ryzhkov feels today, Lyudmila Ryzhkova said "no worse than yesterday, he is already smiling." She said her husband had suffered a "mild heart attack and so far the patient is progressing accordingly". "The pains have subsided somewhat, but it will still take some time for the way he feels to stabilize", the wife of the head of government said.

She said Nikolay Ryzhkov had never complained about his heart before. "But the last year has been very difficult for him. We have not managed to take a vacation, and Nikolay Ivanovich has been very tired". He has been tired, said Lyudmila "not so much by work, which he loves very much, and not even by criticism, but by the carping, and the single-minded and consistent attacks". According to Lyudmila Ryzhkova, Nikolay's last speech at the fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies was very difficult.

Asked about the political position of the head of government, Lyudmila Ryzhkova again emphasized his readiness "to work not for individual politicians, but for the state". Far from all the innovations proposed at the Congress, she said, met with Nikolay Ryzhkov's support.

In his philosophy of life, said Nikolay Ryzhnkov's wife, he "has always taken existing realities as his starting point." It is his deep conviction that "you cannot take revenge on history and you cannot change it. But you must be familiar with it in order to avoid repeating the mistakes of the past".

The interview was interrupted by Lyudmila Ryzhkova's tears, quite understandable considering the situation. Concerning the premier's private life, his wife said that Nikolay Ryzhkov "reads a great deal, mainly historical and economic literature. Even when he is very tired, he cannot get to sleep without a book, more often than not his night reading is a little lighter, a crime thriller for example".

Today we are supported by the fact that thousands of letters and telegrams containing words of support and wishes for a speedy recovery are arriving for Nikolay Ivanovich, Lyudmila Ryzhkova said in conclusion. The geography of their origin is very broad—from Vorkuta to Makhachkala, from the Baltic to the Far East.

Army Chief Discourages Using Reserves

LD2812105390 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 28 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow December 28 TASS—Soviet logistics chief Army General Vladimir Arkhipov has opposed the idea of using the country's strategic reserves to ease food and other shortages.

This would be a short-sighted measure, Arkhipov told TASS.

"It is easy to open stockpiles with state reserves and fill shop shelves with them. But this will only temporarily relieve the situation without guaranteeing future improvements," he said.

The reserves were created for emergencies—natural disasters, environmental catastrophes or bad crop yields. The reserves include food, fuel, clothes, medicines and military hardware and weapons, he explained.

"The way out of the food crisis lies in economic improvement," Arkhipov said.

"We lose tonnes of food products due to inefficiency. There is no guarantee that food from strategic reserves will not rot," he said.

Self-Determination Rights Undermine Union

91UN0566A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Dec 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by USSR People's Deputy Sergey Vasilyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Youth Affairs: "No Right To Suicide"]

[Text] There are documents on display in the foyer of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses: the Georgiyevsk Treaty of 1783, a deed of acceptance of Kazakhstan as a subject of the State of Muscovy issued by Tsar Fedor Ioannovich to Khan Tevekel, and others. Unfortunately, many of my colleagues walk indifferently past these yellowed papers regarding them as merely exhibits and dead antiques. Meanwhile, the significance of this evidence of common historic fortunes of the USSR peoples for the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies is without precedent. Whether some people like it or not, the USSR is a historical and legal successor of the Kingdom of Muscovy and the Russian state. The "great-power" consciousness which left-leaning politicians ridicule and denounce is actually a responsible, patriotic, and humane consciousness.

They frequently talk from the podium of the congress about the complete sovereignty of republics associated with the right of nations to self-determination.

The right of nations to self-determination interpreted as the exclusive right of the "indigenous" nation to a territory and a statehood is a speculative political slogan that initially had no legal meaning of any kind. This slogan put forth by the London congress of the Second International in 1896 was regarded even then as a tool for the disintegration and revolutionary toppling of multinational powers rather than a creative legal norm. This worn- out slogan has now been made the foundation of the draft Union treaty. It appears to me that it is aimed at the further dismemberment of our Motherland into "democratic" principalities.

Given the interspersed settlement of the peoples of the USSR, self-determination solely on the basis of ethnicity cannot be achieved in a democratic manner and is only possible through terror and massive violations of human rights. An ugly system has already formed in the Baltic area in keeping with the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination; the young people of peripheral republics have been corrupted by chauvinism; little fountains of blood are bubbling and gushing on our land. Provocateurs are stealthily bringing in the idea of "an ethnically pure" Russian republic within the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. This is monstrously perfidious.

The sly slogan of the right of nations to self-determination continues to be popular despite the complete absence of any proof or statistics showing that, for example, the sovereign Estonians in 1990 live happier lives than their ancestors in Ostsee Provinces in 1890. On the contrary, judging by the reports in the newspapers of Tallinn, the colorful and rich culture of Estonia is about to be relegated to museums and assimilated and absorbed by Scandinavian- American culture. In this sense, the right of nations to self- determination is the right to commit suicide.

The statement that an escalation of nationalism in the USSR came as a surprise to our supreme leadership is, at

a minimum, unconvincing. A resolution of the U.S. Congress on "captive nations" is widely known. Special literature has existed and exists: analytical reviews, demographic reports at the annual NATO "summits" (meetings at which specific problems are discussed), and long-range political forecasts by leading Western political scientists (Z. Brzezinski et al.) in which processes occurring in the USSR as a result of the declining integrating role of communist ideology are laid out in detail, virtually by the minute...

The explosives of the right of nations to self-determination have once again been planted in the draft Union Treaty. They will blow sooner or later. According to some predictions, about 130 dwarfish pseudo-states are to appear in the territory of the USSR, and our country is to cease being a superpower once and for all.

Could a mathematical majority of misinformed deputies really suffice to break up overnight the unique state which has evolved for centuries?

Paradoxical as it may be at present, a reform of the state structure of the USSR should be started by strengthening unitarism. First of all, constitutional order should be established in the country in the name of defending the rights and dignity of every specific citizen, even if democratic measures do not suffice to this end. The president should ensure the supremacy of USSR laws and avert massive bloodshed by all means at his disposal.

The creation of a strong and respected new union is impossible without the Russians. This special position of the Russians is not at all attributable to some racial superiority, but rather to their numbers, spiritual strength, and their instinct of state. For well- known reasons, participation by the Russians in the current political process is hindered, but not entirely ruled out, despite the fact that some Russian deputies keep apologizing for their background...

At present, many people also link a fair solution to the nationalities problem—and, to my mind, for good reason—to a transition from the ethno-territorial to administrative-territorial division of the country, to giving up the legalized division of the peoples into grades. In this case, administrative units enjoying equal rights—oblasts and krays—should become subjects of the federation. We should gradually upgrade the legal status of present-day oblasts and krays to that of union republics. Otherwise, what do we get? For example, Tyumen Oblast of the RSFSR provides a large segment of all-state hard-currency proceeds, and from an economic point of view surpasses some union republics, yet it has absolutely no rights.

Along with a Soviet of Representatives, a proportionately elected Soviet of Nationalities should be envisaged in enlarged oblasts and krays for the defense of the ethnic interests of various groups of citizens. The state must ensure the exercise of the right of the peoples to extensive cultural and national autonomy (ethnic schools, business associations, churches, newspapers). Finally, every citizen of the union should have the right to individual ethnic self-determination.

...The deeds of incorporation, unification, and annexation of individual lands to Russia and documents of the Soviet period now gathered in the Kremlin have remained significant to this day. These are not merely brittle sheets of paper, this is live history—the woes, joys, blood, hope, and love of our ancestors. The strength of our great country is in unity and indivisibility.

Are we really standing close to this "coffin?" Will no one stop the grave diggers?

Shebarshin Interviewed on KGB Anniversary

91UF0269A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 90 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Lieutenant General L. Shebarshin, head of the KGB First Chief Directorate, by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent Ye. Zhirnov; place and date not given: "Confessions of the Intelligence Chief"]

[Text] **This holiday is not marked in any calendar. Yesterday, at the KGB Central Club, professionals gathered to celebrate for the 70th time Intelligence Officer Day. On this anniversary, our questions are answered by Lieutenant-General L. Shebarshin, KGB deputy chairman and the head of its First Chief Directorate.**

[Zhirnov] Leonid Vladimirovich, seven decades is a considerable time span, even from a historic perspective. Is it not a good time to sum things up?

[Shebarshin] To evaluate the results of our work for this period is extremely difficult. It is even more difficult to interpret the events of those years from today's perspective, as is often done now. Or, even more so, from the perspective of the values of tomorrow that will be ours decades from now. The Soviet intelligence service was born in a country surrounded by enemies. There was a strong and resolute White emigration. An overt intervention had just ended, to be replaced by a covert one. There was a great temptation to squash a weak but potentially very dangerous adversary. Provocation, explosives, individual terror—everything was used.

Only a well organized intelligence service could save the country from accidental blind moves. Naturally, at the first stage the main objects for intelligence efforts were the emigration and those who stood behind it. England, of course, played the leading role. We often look back even now at those first INO BChK [Foreign Department of the All-Union Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counterrevolution and Sabotage] operations. They are classics. Brilliant design, very precise and at the same time consisting of simple steps, operational combinations, and good, practical results. Remember, for instance, the capture of Boris Savinkov and Sidney

Reilly. An extraordinary degree of inventiveness was required to set a trap for such professional terrorists.

In 1930 the main task of foreign intelligence was determined to be uncovering the plans of the major powers and of those immediately outside our borders. Those were far from noble plans. We achieved very good results in that. We penetrated many state organs of Germany, England, and other countries. We obtained German and Italian secret codes which enabled us to receive volumes of vital information without risk. In England we developed major sources, including the legendary Philby Five. There were practically no secrets left from us there.

[Zhirnov] This was in the first part of the thirties. And then?

[Shebarshin] We suffered from the same misfortune as the entire country. As a result of repressions, the chekists lost almost 22,000 from their ranks. Another tragic result was that the foreign network—created at such risk and with such expenditures—was destroyed to a considerable degree. The entire Foreign Department leadership and practically all residents abroad were executed. Some were lured into the Soviet Union, some were brought in clandestinely... By the time the war started the intelligence had been beheaded and was in a shambles.

[Zhirnov] But it did retain the agent network?

[Shebarshin] Yes, the helpers were there. They, together with new intelligence cadres, started to restore the lost capabilities. This delicate organism can be easily destroyed in one fell swoop, but you cannot grow a new tree from a stump—you have to plant a new seedling.

Today we get, once in a while, reformers who propose to change the KGB, or to cut it in half. And why not down to a quarter? This is simply a reformist itch. It was easy to chop down the vineyards, too! It is always hard to predict the consequences of any blow to an intelligence service. But in reality any reformer who comes to power needs our services within a month or two.

[Zhirnov] Including scientific and technical intelligence?

[Shebarshin] We have been watching military-technological progress in the West since the twenties. We have obtained the materials on the production of synthetic gasoline, on making explosives, and on protection from chemical attacks. Especially important was motor and airplane building information. These data brought practical results during the war.

At the same time we have also achieved major results in the area of nuclear intelligence. In March 1943 Kurchatov reported to the USSR Council of People's Commissars that the data obtained through intelligence were of enormous importance to the state and to science. These data provided extremely important benchmarks for our research, and also made it possible to avoid many time and effort consuming phases in the work on this problem. We are talking about the atomic bomb.

[Zhirnov] That is, foreign intelligence is a department whose work is highly cost-effective?

[Shebarshin] Well, it is hard to compare the effectiveness of foreign intelligence with that of KGB's other branches. Each has its own specifics. But in the conditions of the technological blockade—and this has not stopped since the day our state was founded—we are often the only channel for obtaining leading edge technology. As for purely economic effectiveness... One American magazine stated that we had purchased documentation worth $3 million for $600. I will not deny or confirm this specific case. But this numeric relationship is quite realistic. Some material more than covers all our intelligence expenditures.

[Zhirnov] Can everything you "find" be utilized?

[Shebarshin] Alas, no. Sometimes implementation requires more efforts—although less risk—than intelligence. This is our misfortune.

[Zhirnov] Leonid Vladimirovich, the example with Kurchatov tells us that during the war the intelligence effort was directed against the allies as well?

[Shebarshin] Yes, we had that task then, on par with regular tasks of political intelligence and penetration behind the enemy lines. There is not, and cannot be, a full openness in relations between countries. And at that time it was necessary to be on the lookout. It is known that the Americans had operational negotiations with the Germans. Hitler's deputy, Hess, for some reason ended up in England. Also, soon after the victory the cold war started. And we are not the only party that should be blamed for that.

A secret war—complete with the use of arms, explosives, bribes, and kidnappings—was being conducted against us in parallel with the propaganda war. We were forced to fend off the enemy and to protect ourselves. For that we had quite good intelligence assets in the leadership of all military-political groups created by the United States. We also had good assets in the leadership of the major world powers. Some day I will tell about this line of our work, but not very soon.

[Zhirnov] Perhaps, you can answer a question about the most recent matters The world is changing now, and the degree of change is not less than it was after the war. The socialist camp has disintegrated, and the allied intelligence services have become adversary intelligence services. Is not this true?

[Shebarshin] Completely true. We are aware of that and draw our own conclusions. We do not have any hostile intentions towards our former partners. We are interested in maintaining relations with the special services of East European countries. We have common enemies—organized crime, the drug mafia, and terrorism. We are ready to cooperate with any special service in these areas.

[Zhirnov] Are you not worried that they will now be watching our country, and rather professionally? After all, many of them grew up within these walls.

[Shebarshin] I do not wish to use the words "some people," but we know that the process of using this potential for conducting intelligence against the USSR has started. We keep an eye on this situation. And if these information-gathering activities are conducted within civilized limits which are acceptable to us (and it is in my interest to make these limits wide enough), I do not see any reasons to object.

[Zhirnov] It seems that not only the world of intelligence, but the intelligence officers themselves are changing these days.

[Shebarshin] If we talk in general, intelligence is a collective effort. It is important not only to obtain information, but to analyze it. The picture of the problem under consideration, and of the potential actions of this or that country emerges from little bits and pieces. Intelligence is becoming more and more intellectual. During the years of secret war we put major emphasis on the operational training of our cadres; now the balance is tilting more towards the analytical side. Naturally, the training of our cadres is changing, too.

I am striving to have intelligence officers who are first of all intellectuals. They should be cultured and well-rounded. They should have native ability in at least one foreign language.

Still, the most important quality is absolute reliability. He must be loyal to his Fatherland. He must know that the fate of his Motherland depends on his every action. We are striving to achieve this hidden inner flame in each of our officers. This is the most powerful incentive in our work. Another important quality of this professional trait that we all develop—I do not want to use the word "pretend"—is to look the way out interlocutor expects us to, to blend in. Gradually it becomes part of our blood. A good intelligence officer is one who is not noticeable, who can change with the environment. This helps in accomplishing the tasks.

I have spent many years in this service, and have worked abroad. Both I and my comrades drew strength from the fact that behind us stood a great, powerful country, with an immense economy, a country that would not give ground to anyone in anything. This helped us hold tight in difficult situations. To always believe that help would be on the way. To feel yourself as part of a larger undertaking, which did not start with you and would not end with you.

[Zhirnov] Do you believe in its great future?

[Shebarshin] As a native Russian who knows Russian history I can say: I believe that this confused time will pass. Our country will be a modern, progressive, powerful state that will not be an object of petty aid or large scale economic plunder. I have faith in this, and much of what has been accomplished in our great country in the centuries past was built on faith...

Moldovan Union Treaty Rejection Viewed

91UN0565B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIA correspondent I. Vishnevskaya under the rubric "Events in Moldova: An Insider View": "The Calm Before the Storm"]

[Text] Kishinev—"Why are the Russians leaving? Nobody is chasing them away." The question is very sincere, and it comes from George Gimpu, Moldova People's Deputy and the leader of the new Democratic Party, also a person who is generally well known in the republic's political circles.

It is true that in Moldova the Russians are not being thrown out of their apartments, and they are not being stabbed in the streets. The banner "Suitcase—Railway Station—Russia!" is no longer hanging on the square by the monument to the great statesman Stefan Cel Mare. Even during rallies the speakers have stopped blaming the Russians exclusively for all the misfortunes that have befallen their people. More and more seldom does one hear the tired word "occupier." It looks as if the nationalistic tension has finally peaked. But the problems and questions that were not resolved are still there. That is why the Russians keep coming to the Center for Forced Relocation from Moldova, set up by the Society for Russian Culture.

The feeling of discomfort started a year ago when the republic passed the law on the state language—Moldavian.

Time went by, passions flared up, but diplomacy was still kept on the back burner. Both sides were already dipping into history: One side was trying to prove that because of the length of time spent here they had put down the roots; the other—that everyone on this territory, except Moldovans, is either an alien, an occupier, or a mancurt [mythical tribe without ethnic roots], and therefore has no right to make demands. Political leaders called for compromises while holding their own positions firm. Only the press was working hard. So by the time when, tired of waiting for a "yes" from the parliament, both Gagauz and the Dnester area announced that they would form independent republics, the peoples representing each side were fully convinced of the rightness of their cause and that the ends justified the means.

On the eve of elections to the Gagauz republic supreme soviet, many thousands-strong detachments of volunteers sanctioned by the government went to the borders of southern regions.

However, any force causes resistance. As could be expected, the volunteers were blocked on their way by volunteers from the Gagauz regions: Bulgarians, Russians, Ukrainians, Gagauz, Germans, and Albanians...

They were also resolved to fight to the last. The confrontation lasted four days. Why the civil war, which was talked about as inevitable on both sides of the barricades, did not start, I do not know. I think it was a miracle—I do not have a more rational explanation. After all, the nerves of both the volunteers, the militia, and the special mission militia detachments personnel that accompanied the volunteers were frayed.

Then the Ministry of Internal Affairs internal troops entered the southern regions, and the danger passed. The disaster took place several days later where it was not expected—in the small city of Dubossary on the Left Bank. Three men died and nine were wounded by firearms in the clash between the city residents and the militia squads that had arrived here to break the blockade of the rayon people's court, the procuracy, and the office of the rayispolkom [rayon executive committee] chairman.

The original pretext for the conflict in Moldova was no longer important. Now many understand that the language is a great sieve to filter off material for building a national-totalitarian regime in the kray. The authors of the law on the state language gave the Russian-speaking population several years to study the language. The people rushed, with great enthusiasm, to the cooperatives, promising intensive language training in the shortest time possible. The enterprises were opening their coffers, spending generous sums for their employees' language studies. The "non-natives" were in a hurry, while the natives were sending to Gagauz and the Left Bank regions documents written exclusively in the state language. Bus, trolley, and route stops sported shiny new signs—in Moldavian only. "This is against the law," G. Gimpu, a member of the Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Permanent Commission on Inter-ethnic Issues, told me. "The people who should be held responsible for this are the enterprise administrators: the chief administrators of trusts and departments, and the directors of bus and trolley depots. This needs to be brought up in court!"

We are convinced, however, that none of the Russian-speaking residents would dare do that—that would be asking for trouble. Besides, the problem is not really the language. Otherwise the new power would not have conducted a wholesale replacement of ministers and their deputies, ethnic Moldovans; it would not have proposed the draft law on local self-government that, in substance, gives legal underpinning for republic government's autocratic rule and effectively abolishes the soviets; and it would not have refused to pass a law on a referendum. Romanization has enveloped all societal structures, even the church. Young people were sent to a neighboring country for liturgical studies; visiting priests were expected to arrive from there to teach in the seminary and to conduct services in parishes.

Meanwhile the Supreme Soviet and the government officially denied the rumors that had been stirring anxiety among the population—about unification with Romania. Nevertheless in the border rayons—Kagulskiy, Ryshkanskiy, and Leovskiy—volunteers had deposed local governments. At the same time demands went out calling for the demolition of engineering and technical structures on the border. At rallies big and small we hear increasingly insistent demands to remove Soviet troops from the territory of the republic, to dismantle the Lenin monument (by the way, one will not see the USSR state flag in Kishinev, but it still flies in Gagauz and the Dnester area), to not sign the Union treaty. More and more one hears the slogans: "Long Live Great Romania!," "Romania the Mother!," and "Romanians, unite!" Last Sunday the issue of the fate of the republic was moved from the parliament's hall to the square, entrusting it to the Great National Assembly. Before the discussion of the Union treaty even started, Yurie Roshka, chairman of the executive committee of the National Front of Moldova, proposed to honor those who had died in the fight against the communist regime with a minute of silence. And the people on the square fell silent. This is how, for the first time, the idea of changing not just signs but of an entire ideology was publicly proposed. Then Ion Hadyrke, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Moldova, spoke. "What is in the Union treaty for us?" he asked. And he answered himself: "It is a trap into which we are being lured for the second time; it is an attempt to enter the same river twice. The Union means a single diktat, a single foreign policy, a single territory, and Russian as a state language." For six hours people on the square said more or less the same things. And not one asked what awaits the minorities if Moldova does not sign the treaty.

Whether the Union treaty will be signed or not is still an open question. The republic workers gather in meetings and collect signatures. In which direction the scale of public opinion will tilt is hard to predict. One thing is clear: Not to sign the treaty today means to aggravate the political situation in the republic, to cut off the way back for the Gagauz and Dnester area republics, and thus to dismember Moldova, thus possibly unleashing the republic guard created to protect its sovereignty. Then the calm that everybody is happy about today will turn into a storm.

Militia's 'Spetsnaz' Force Discussed

91UN0562A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Dec 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by A. Batashev in the column "Top Secret": "'Spetsnaz' Means Risk"]

[Text] ...We did not manage to meet the personnel of Major Dmitriy T.'s group this day.

Lieutenant Colonel Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich A. told us: "The group is in action, including its reserve."

After a pause, he added:

"I am waiting for them to come back, and to see whether all of them will..."

These words made me feel a sense of alarm which was concealed from us for a long time behind the smiles, jokes, and emphatically precise movements of these athletic young people who are usually referred to in press copy by their first names only.

This operation took three days. More than 50 people were apprehended. Radio sets, firearms, and sidearms were confiscated. It turned out that members of the criminal group had been taking regular karate classes in a spacious hall large enough to play soccer. Their leader used to spend three hours daily perfecting the techniques of his combat skills. However, he still missed the moment for which he had prepared with such care: The handcuffs were clasped on his wrists before he managed to assume his combat position.

Risk is one of the permanent components of everyday work by Spetsnaz [special operations] personnel.

Senior Sergeant Aleksandr B. noted: "There are different kinds of risk. If there is more of it than is acceptable, it is a risky venture; if there is less, it is cowardice. If there is risk within the bounds of reason, this is a normal line of behavior."

All of this was true. However, I understood how high the standard of risk was when I saw the face of the colonel who was waiting for the young men to return from their assignment.

Several years ago, Dmitriy T. took part in an operation involving the apprehension of an armed criminal who, having taken two hostages, a man and a woman, had barricaded himself on the premises of the Moscow office of the Finnair airline.

Dmitriy could not shoot because he was afraid of hitting the hostages. This is why he opted for a different tactic: He showed himself in the doorway from time to time to draw the fire.

Maj. Dmitriy T., a master of sports in unarmed combat and judo, told us:

"By the time I started 'playing' with the criminal by showing myself in the doorway, the criminal had already put a hostage against the wall: Say your prayers... It was precisely at this moment that I took a step into the doorway, and the criminal fired his double-barrelled gun at me rather than the hostage. Later, he made the man lie down next to the door and made the woman sit next to him so we could not rush into the door. He also had an improvised explosive device there.

"The terrorist wore a mask, and for this reason I could not predict his actions based on the look in his eyes and the expression of his face. I responded to the movement of his hands because he shot from the hip.

"I established contact with the hostage by gestures and communicated to him that he had to run away as soon as the next shot rang out. He seized an opportunity and rushed into the street.

"Perhaps, I had been playing a live target for more than an hour before the criminal went wrong. For a long time, he had made no mistakes: Having fired once, he had immediately reloaded the shotgun so that at any moment he could fire a bullet from either barrel. Suddenly he could not bear it any more, and fired twice in a row. This time, the woman also managed to get away... Then the criminal tried to break through. He fired at me and rushed into the doorway in order to cause panic by discharging his shotgun into the crowd and flee. However, he did not manage to pull the trigger because I pushed the barrel to the ground and tripped him up.

"All of this took more than two hours. During this period of time, the terrorist fired 15 times, seven times at pointblank range."

Here is one more story which makes it possible to appreciate the standard of risk in the work of "Spetsnaz" personnel.

Sr. Sgt. Aleksandr B., a candidate master of sports in unarmed combat and the holder of a black belt in karate, narrated:

"Several months ago, attacks on ambulance paramedics became more frequent. Robbers threatening them with weapons took medical preparations containing narcotics . Our associate Aleksey V. went on an evening call with an ambulance crew. He went alone in order not to arouse the suspicions of drug pushers who, as we knew, had the ambulance under surveillance. In a doorway, Aleksey was surrounded by three people who held knives to his throat and stomach. However, Aleksey who used to be a boxer managed to do a professional job on them. He apprehended two of them himself, and we jumped the third one in the street."

As a rule, an arrest takes several seconds. However, many hours of training at a shooting range, in a gym, and in a swimming pool precede these lightning-speed, error-free jobs... In addition, all of these guys train for several hours on their own every day.

Captain Sergey K., a master of sports in gymnastics, explained this to me: "Physical stress is a mere condition for the game. As far as psychological stress is concerned, it is harder to handle, all the more so because here it is several times greater than, say, in criminal investigations."

...They were supposed to apprehend a group of particularly dangerous criminals that evening who, according to the data of the criminal investigations department, had four firearms.

Sergey K. narrated: "As their car was entering a highway, our car 'happened' to block their way. The criminals did not even feel that we 'were on to them' already. We forced our way into their car. The two who were in the front seats did not manage to offer resistance. The third one, the ringleader, leaned back and grabbed a pistol..."

Gennadiy interjected: "I was at the back door at the time and I saw him lift his hand. I understood that I could dodge the bullet only by falling down. This is when I did a split. The barrel of the pistol followed my head."

Later, when they were at a rayon militia precinct, Sergey K. asked the ringleader;

"Why did you not fire?"

The ringleader observed as if making an excuse: "I did want to fire at first but when I saw that you had trained three weapons on me I changed my mind."

There are no random people in this detachment. All of them knew what they were joining and what they were to do. Perhaps, it is not worthwhile to mention financial "lures." The pay of Spetsnaz personnel is only 25 rubles higher than that of regular militia employees that, as I see it, is clearly unfair. Therefore, what brought these young people to the detachment?

Dmitriy T. said: "My father and grandfather were Muscovites. Therefore, what is so surprising about my desire to protect the Muscovites and my conviction that I can do it?"

Andrey G., a first category in unarmed combat, came to the detachment for another reason. He said: "My father also worked in the militia in Lyubertsy near Moscow. He was shot at several times and was wounded twice... To my mind, this is enough to understand why I came here."

Aleksandr B. is convinced that his one and only path in the stream of life should lead through the Spetsnaz.

He said: "To be sure, when I take part in operations I do not think about it. I concentrate strictly on my professional tasks. However, deep down I know that I am on the side of justice."

Aleksandr added: "There is one more consideration. Many of us are absorbed by the aspiration to emulate somebody in everything, private life and work alike, subordinating ourselves to the models offered by the cinema, the television, and the press. In this manner, we suppress our individuality and blunt our ability to think and feel originally. I have been greatly interested in oriental martial arts since I was 14. Their goal is to help a person understand his essence and reinforce himself not only physically but also inwardly and spiritually. In this case, you accomplish yourself as a person through actions and deeds. You do not emulate anybody or grovel before anyone. This means that you do not use force for a bad cause obeying an idol..."

As I was listening to it, different words surfaced in my memory, the words of both Aleksandr himself and his comrades. Here are these words...

Aleksandr B.: "'A hunter will never kill a bird which seeks refuge on his chest'—such is an ancient Japanese moral postulate. We should also remember this—we cannot be cruel and vengeful with regard to the weak and the vanquished."

Dmitriy T.: "Once we stormed an apartment in which there was a mentally disturbed man who was threatening his neighbors with a weapon. When everything was over he turned to us and asked: 'Guys, will you come to me again? Will you visit me in the hospital?'"

...They buried Sergeant Vladimir Zhirnov that day.

In the morning, the group was returning from an operation. Volodya was driving, and suddenly a bus with its cruise light off darted across their path. Zhirnov managed to steer the vehicle so that he would suffer the impact himself...

A freshly dug grave was half full of water.

Volodya's comrades approached a grave digger: "What are we to do? How can we lower a coffin there?"

The grave digger answered: "If you don't like it I am not going to do anything at all. You are having a funeral here (he said it as if a funeral were something like entertainment) and I work here. Don't you mess with me..."

Having understood that this conversation would not end well, one of the officers ran there and took the guys aside. Later they took off their belts, tied buckets to them which they found in the office, and began to bail out the water. Then the coffin was lowered into the grave. A salute rang out. All of them counted automatic weapons salvos in their minds knowing that at these very moments the water was flooding the coffin...

On this occasion, the Spetsnaz men could not do anything because they alone are not capable of defending the living and the dead against the malice and intolerance which are irrepressibly spreading all over our country.

Response to OGONEK Criticism of Medvedev

91UN0563A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Vladimir Chebotarev: "The Inferiority Complex"]

[Text] "I have not read Pasternak, but I will say that..."—efficient reporters prepared such epistles signed by electric locomotive engineers or brigade leaders of assembly workers as urgent assignments of their editorial offices in quite recent times. It happened (on many occasions) that the signatures of professors and even academicians under the "resolutely denouncing" or "wrathfully stigmatizing" lines were secured by hook or by crook. In this case, addresses to fellow citizens usually began as follows: "Having familiarized myself with...I consider it my duty to state." Alas, very few people summoned up their courage to disgustedly refuse to participate in unworthy games.

Fortunately these times are gone. However, the prevailent practices then have turned out to be surprisingly tenacious of life. The line separating the two genres has turned out to be fuzzy in our stormy times when the foundations are cracking and dogmas are coming down. In issue 50 of OGONEK, a letter appeared by a professor of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Diplomatic Academy, V. Pechkurov, who maintained: Roy Medvedev does not have the right to call himself a historian because his books are a rendition of Western sovietologists rather than scientific works. In this case, V. Pechkurov displayed touching unanimity with the unforgettable Nina Andreyeva, and the magazine OGONEK—with its mirror image, MOLODAYA GVARDIYA.

Do these coinciding opposites have anything to do with reality? It is a pity that neither V. Pechkurov nor his colleague in the field of instruction and journalism named the books of R. Medvedev in which he "copied from Western sovietologists" or the names of scientists from whom he "borrowed." Meanwhile, it would be good to bolster by facts this serious charge of plagiarism that, generally speaking, R. Medvedev could bring a lawsuit. However, "the critics" seldom go to the trouble of doing such work: The pathos of condemnation replaces the absence of facts. Let us sort this out.

The point is that until 1989 R. Medvedev could only publish all of his books abroad where any person "copying" would have been immediately found out. Western historians and sovietologists invariably found facts and testimony that were new to them in all of these books, analyzing the events of the entire period of Soviet history from the October Revolution to the current reforms, and put them in further scientific circulation. In the last two years, Soviet readers have also been able to familiarize themselves with some of these books. Habitual references to the works of R. Medvedev are found in almost all serious Western works on Soviet history. The greatest authorities and sovietologists—Robert Tucker, Harrison Salisbury, and Steven Cohen—are honored to write a preface to Medvedev's books or to include his works in collected articles of which they are editors. Could it be that they copy back from Medvedev what he has previously copied from their writings?

We should add to this that the books of R. Medvedev are printed and reprinted by the publishing houses of the most prestigious Western universities—Oxford, Cambridge, and Columbia. They have been translated into all the major languages of the world, and the total number of publications has long been in the hundreds. Many are required reading for those studying the history of the USSR.

It is sometimes interesting to figure out motives prompting a person to take to writing and twist commonly known facts. Apparently there may be two motives. The first is that the author is just not familiar with these facts. The second is that the author knows the facts but, as Stalin used to say in such cases, so much the worse for the facts. Presumably the readers are entitled to expect familiarity with the facts in cases when the title of professor accompanies a signature.

However, it is not all that simple. It has to do with the fact that, in general, it is difficult to determine the scope of scientific interests of the author of the letter on the basis of the signature "Professor of the Foreign Ministry Diplomatic Academy." It turned out that Professor Pechkurov is a specialist on sociopolitical terminology in the modern Indonesian language and a candidate of philological sciences.

In this case, it is important for us that despite the resounding title, we will have to assume one thing—elementary unfamiliarity with the facts. Many things will become easy to understand in this case. After all, it is easy to become confused if you hear about something for the first time in your life. For example, R. Medvedev wrote the monograph "China and the Superpowers," could have never asserted what Pechkurov attributes to him. It is enough to look through the chapters on the dispute with the Chinese leadership in the works mentioned to make sure of this.

With whom is the esteemed professor in sympathy? He immediately rejects the criticism of A. Tsypko by R. Medvedev and believes the former to be "a more profound thinker." Well, as a poet put it, everyone makes a choice in his own likeness. As I see it, the following description circulated by one of the opponents of Lysenko may very well be applied to the eclectic and confused writings of A. Tsypko: There is a lot in them that is new and correct; however, what is correct is unfortunately not new, and what is new is unfortunately not correct. Besides, we can hardly be serious about the scientific claims of a person who resorts, for example, to the following arguments in a scientific dispute: "By now they say on every corner and in every line..." The revelations of Doctor of Philosophical Sciences A. Tsypko, a recent CPSU Central Committee consultant, who understood in his 50's that "nothing develops one's mind and heart better than a search for God," are not all that immune to criticism.

At the outset of his scientific career, V. Pechkurov wrote explaining his choice: "The selection of sociopolitical terminology as a research subject is due to the requirements...of translating the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism into Indonesian." (the author's abstract of his candidate dissertation, Moscow State Institute of International Relations, 1970). However, toward the end of his letter to OGONEK he expressed his hope that the activities of R. Medvedev "will be ultimately confined within the framework of the CPSU, and he will share its lot."

I would like to remind the esteemed professor that in the time of stagnation Medvedev was already expelled from the party for his convictions. At present, they are trying "to excommunicate" him from science for political

reasons. The books by R. Medvedev have already survived the test of time, and having circulated the world over, are gradually coming back to the motherland. Will the hastily slapped-together writings of the recent apologists of "developed socialism" find their readers in Indonesia?

Sobchak Views Presidential Structures

91UN0559A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 49, Dec 90 p 5

[Report on interview with Anatoliy Sobchak, chairman of the Leningard City Soviet, by SOYUZ special correspondent Sergey Krayukhin, place and date not given: "Anatoliy Sobchak: I Look For Like-Minded People in the Leningrad Soviet"]

[Text] Early December was marked in Leningrad by the introduction of ration cards for food, increases in the crime rate and drug addiction, and a deteriorating supply of drinking water for the citizens. Against the background of these and other social and economic troubles, actions of the body of deputies of the Leningrad Soviet and its chairman have been increasingly criticized, drawing particularly heavy fire from the TV program "600 Seconds." Speaking at the "Svetlana" Association, TV commentator Nevzorov said without mincing words too much: "I understand that Sobchak is alone, that he is beating off a dozen imbeciles and several dozen scoundrels. I understand that everything he is doing is being sabotaged. However, I cannot understand why he...is not seizing power. He has such an opportunity..."

Perhaps, Sobchak would not be true to himself if he became the proponent of "an iron fist" and deviated from constitutional norms. This is what our conversation with Anatoliy Aleksandrovich was about.

[Krayukhin] What can you say about the current power structure—voices are heard saying that it is presidential rather than soviet?

[Sobchak] I can say that the soviet power we have is a system that absolutely does not work and is in need of very serious changes! The reason is that the soviets conceived by Lenin as corporations adopting legislative acts, executing them, and monitoring their own decisions turned out to be ineffective. The final result turned out the way we see it. I am a proponent of a very serious reform of the current system of soviets both in terms of numbers and the forms of election, mutual relations, and work. We need a regular democratic republic with the separation of powers and the direct elections of executive organs, including city mayors, by the populace.

Now for presidential power. We still do not have real presidential power. Such a system will only exist when a certain vertical structure develops under it supporting the president. At present, the head of state leans on the Federation Council and the Presidential Council that are advisory organs. All other structures are semi-dependent. For example, the president does have, to be sure, certain powers regarding the Council of Ministers, but the government is formed by the Supreme Soviet along with presidential power. This is why, if there were a chairman of the Council of Ministers elected by the Supreme Soviet and confirmed by the Congress of People's Deputies other than, say, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, he would be entitled to say: "You know, Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have been elected just like you, and this is why I am going to resolve issues the way I see fit."

This is it; this would be an absolutely legitimate way to raise this issue. This is why for now we do not have real presidential power. A paralysis of power functions which occurs here is mainly due to the fact that our president acts for the most part as CPSU general secretary and leans for the most part on party organs. I believe that this pours oil on the fire and exacerbates a political crisis.

I think that at present it is of paramount significance to implement the proposals of the USSR Supreme Soviet—to create a number of organs which the president will be able to lean on in his actions, truly democratic organs formed by the republics—an inter- republic economic committee, a supreme political council, and a hard-currency committee. The structures comprised of republic officials will make it possible for the president to find support in the relevant republic organs and work out collective decisions with the participation of the republics. Besides, the president will acquire his own structure—for example, the National Security Committee. In the absence of this reform, presidential decisions and decrees amount to nothing but stirring the air.

As far as the presidential system of power is concerned, I see nothing bad about it. It should be created. However, an independent parliament and independent judicial power should definitely counterbalance it. In this case, the system will be quite in line with normal conditions for the operation of a democratic state.

[Krayukhin] What is your assessment of the role of personality under current historical conditions?

[Sobchak] Naturally the role of personality grows and manifests itself more markedly at abrupt turning points in history, such as at present. The role of the political figures of state seems to be less conspicuous at other times, when the course of life in a country is fortunate, but it is not insignificant. In crucial eras, politicians express some particularly important ideas and become no less popular than outstanding movie stars or athletes. At present, the interest taken in political leaders is extremely great; likewise, their responsibility is boundless. As far as the real role of personality is concerned, it will become truly powerful when genuinely democratic structures are created. Under a totalitarian system—many aspects of it have not been overcome yet—the role of a particular individual is reduced considerably. In this case, the personality and the system oppose each other,

and the system is always capable of crushing, leveling, and distorting the decisions made.

[Krayukhin] To follow up on this question: How would you define at present the potential of M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin?

[Sobchak] I think that both of them are outstanding politicians. One heads the union, and the other heads Russia. As far as their opposition and a certain struggle which is now underway are concerned, this can also be very easily explained: One is the proponent of a certain political concept, and the other expresses a somewhat different tendency in our political life. However, whatever the explanation, this opposition is unacceptable because it destroys the state and destabilizes political life. This is why I am a proponent of these two outstanding statesmen reaching a common ground, working out a common solution, and jointly implementing it. We risk losing both of them unless this happens. In this case, we run the risk of completely different people and completely different forms of government turning up in our political life. If we want democracy, if we want to move forward rather than go back, we should do everything in order to pool the efforts of Gorbachev and Yeltsin rather than oppose them to each other. This is what I see as one of my main tasks.

[Krayukhin] Do you think the present conflict between the Leningrad Soviet chairman and the deputies is due to the nature of your strong and active personality and to a manifestation of opposition to such vigorous actions? Taking into account this situation, do you not try to restrain yourself somehow?

[Sobchak] I would explain the conflict which does occur in political rather than psychological terms. When I agreed to come to the Leningrad Soviet I counted on finding like-minded people there with whom we would be involved in a common endeavor, moving toward the creation of a multiparty system and a real democratic society. Unfortunately, I encountered there people with an entirely different mindset who can be called democrats only as a matter of convention, only on the basis of slogans which they utter at various kinds of rallies, but who are essentially far removed from democracy. It is precisely this striving of a certain group to subordinate everything to its interests that has caused me to counteract it seriously. To my mind, my task as chairman is to create a civilized, democratic multiparty system.

[Krayukhin] In your opinion, how can the shattered prestige of the Leningrad Soviet be boosted?

[Sobchak] It so happened that the city soviet made the most unfortunate decisions during my absence, and I could not prevent them—for example, an appeal to the mass media by the Leningrad Soviet about which there was much ado and unpleasantness. Only the decisions of the authorities and specific work which benefit the city and change the very difficult life of the Leningraders for the better will secure trust and respect for us. Food aid from Germany and other countries has begun arriving in the city now. We have decided that the deputies would participate directly in the fair distribution of foodstuffs among the low-income populace and in the continuous strict monitoring of this action. Similar live actions rather than endless loquacity in front of microphones, which has become the norm, are capable of improving the rating of deputies.

Sovereignty Overrules 'Common Sense'

91UN0557A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 20 Dec 90 pp 1, 2

[Article by Valeriy Badov, editor of the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA Department of New Methods of Economic Operations: "If I Were a Separatist... Political Phantasmagorias at the 'Sovereignty Parade'"]

[Text] **"...Russia needs people, Russia needs a party; in their absence, everything has gone and will go to the dogs." This frank thought was stated to Vronskiy by his schoolmate Serpukhovskiy, who had made a brilliant carrier in Turkestan. To my mind, this is a mysterious and unexplained page in "Anna Karenina." There is almost nothing on the political issues of the day in a novel on the private lives of high-society people. Only in this one-on-one conversation between Cavalry Captain Vronskiy and General Serpukhovskiy was it mentioned that things were bad in the Russian Empire. What did Serpukhovskiy mean when he tried to convince Vronskiy that nobody but the independent people of their circle, hereditary noblemen, were capable of safeguarding the throne and the Motherland and averting the future Tsushimas? Tolstoy did not clarify this; at any rate, Serpukhovskiy did not mean a military coup.**

I am not drawing obvious analogies here. Neither generals and colonels in the roles of parliamentary tribunes nor the barracks-style abuse of the head of state are new phenomena in our Motherland. If an analogy indeed comes to mind, here it is. Serpukhovskiy was alarmed by the presence of a very limited number of true statesmen at the helm of power in Russia. He made a stinging observation about reformers who held power: "They pursue some thought, some direction they do not believe themselves which is for the worse. This entire direction is merely a device to have an official residence and a certain salary."

Now, a century later, is this not what every one is saying again?

Several days ago, Leszek Balcerowicz discussed the methods of Polish transition to market relations intelligibly and clearly on TV. We did not hear any real revelations. However, the "Balcerowicz plan" is working, is it not? Nobody grabs Mr. Balcerowicz by the lapel or holds him down. The Polish Sejm does not habitually flip-flop on issues, as do many delegates of the Russian Extraordinary Congress. Having come to their senses, they began anew to exorcise the devil of the private ownership of land.

Another respectable deputy vouches that if one-tenth of the gold reserve of our country is deposited in the armored vaults of the "gnomes of Zurich" as a collateral, the ruble will soon become convertible and the merchandise shortage will disappear. They believe him eagerly and are surprised that the Ministry of Finance is still procrastinating.

In a former Union republic, the entire available reserve of hard currency was blown to print "their own" currency abroad. This is precisely what happens when money is not worth the paper it is printed on.

Speaking recently to the "captains" of industry, the president of the country tried passionately to convince them that our unfortunate cost-driven economy had lapsed into reverse as early as the end of the 1980's rather than during the last, "market" week. I noticed distrustful and frowning faces in the hall.

This "ABC" is strange.

What about communal quarrels and virtual brawls in the new, democratically elected soviets?

The nomenklatura system produced ignoramuses who knew their place. They governed as ordered and made prepared statements. The present-day "babes of state" who have embarked on "the sovereignty parade" and "the war of laws" are flesh of the flesh, the offsprings of the nomenklatura ignoramuses for life. They much too much resemble each other in their manners and their attraction to shopping and foreign lands.

The public is little by little losing interest in democracy, having seen enough of the fussy people it elevates. The proponents of "an iron fist" who at one time kept their mouths shut will not let this opportunity slip away.

I will venture the assertion that of all the present shortages, a shortage of statesmanlike wisdom is the most pernicious.

It is for a reason that most of the politicians with whom Gorbachev began perestroyka have left the field. Under Brezhnev, people who had ideas that were to any degree their own were forced out of the Politburo; this time, it was the other way around. If we imagine for a moment that as early as the June 1987 plenum Gorbachev had plainly proposed to his comrades-in-arms to replace a command economy with free entrepreneurship he would have been removed. Five long years were spent to impress on inert luminaries in all echelons of power, from the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] to rural rayon committees, that there is no alternative to a transition to the market. Precious time was lost. Despite stated intentions, the economy dragged itself along the old command track and sank all the way down to the hubs of its wheels. The country is deep in debt. The multiplication of printed words is the only prosperous economic sector. One may purchase a newspaper—a stick of political dynamite—for 10 to 50 kopeks in a subway passage.

However, a society cannot consist of 280 million inveterate politicians. This degree of politicization will do us no good. Before our very eyes, the chimeras of populism are gaining the upper hand over common sense. A true political phantasmagoria is unfolding, as if we were not a modern industrial state and a nuclear superpower but rather some kind of horde where continuous commotion reigns, and where one may wake up in the morning as the subject of a just created state or the member of a party one has not sought to join.

Indeed, when Boris Yeltsin stated for the entire country to hear that he did not rule out a scenario of "divorcing" Russia from the USSR, bringing about the division of not only property but also... armaments, it took the breath away from the ardent adherents of sovereignty. However, will it not be revealed how unsound and unrealizable such an approach is—provided this was not said rashly, and if, God forbid, it indeed comes to dividing up the warheads?

And what about promises to set up free economic zones in virtually one in two oblasts and krays from the Urals to Nakhodka? Does this not resemble "the generous handing out of elephants?"

"Be realistic: Demand the impossible!" This slogan was very popular during the 1968 "May revolution" in Paris when the great city fell for a short time to leftists who were holding rallies. It appears that our populists have adopted this slogan and relied on it for support. Alas, the difference is that Paris snapped out of it. "The revolution" did not last any longer than a carnival in Rio, and subsequently the banks, plants, and cafes with entertainment opened again. The French got down to business. The slogan "Demand the impossible!" was forgotten as the childish impulse of a nation. As I see it, the mood of our populists and the subverters of our foundations is much more resolute. They indeed intend to grab history by the lapels, and they will not abandon their pursuit.

This populist frenzy manifests itself in the most severe manner when it comes to the Union treaty. The Fourth Congress, which should give birth to this treaty in torment, is in session in the Kremlin. I expect the initial text to undergo significant compromise changes. This should have been expected because in civilized countries even marital contracts are the result of coordinating and reconciling the property interests of the parties. This is to say nothing about a treaty of nations and republics. However, right away politicians holding the leading elected positions in a number of Union republics steadfastly refused to participate in the treaty even if it were the best there is. I do not doubt that very many of those who have voted for these politicians in the elections are wholeheartedly of the same mind. Those who hesitate and scratch their heads are, of course, apostates and "collaborators." New politicians in the republics say plainly that to them the USSR is "someone else's" state.

By now foreign countries are seriously concerned about the Union being on the brink of disintegration. Millions

of "Russian-speakers" in the republics are shuddering at the thought of what awaits them if they suddenly become "foreigners." Meanwhile, the Russian parliament triumphantly, to the sound of kettle drums, is signing "horizontal" treaties with the new sovereign governments, assuring the public that in this manner a new fabric of a unified Union market is being created instead of a system of distribution from the center which has fallen apart. The Russian deputies are sort of thumbing their noses at the Union Government in full view of the foreign countries.

What is actually happening if we take a look having come down to our sinful earth rather than from the mountain heights of sovereignties? Local bureaucracies have carved into pieces the old Gosplan "blanket." They are fussing with these scanty blankets which they are pulling over themselves every which way, but they are still cold. In reality, industrial deliveries from the Ukraine to Russia and counter deliveries are being made as poorly as they used to be because neither Moscow nor Kiev holds sway for minor "sovereignties." The dry "residue" of the treaty contains merely a mutual acknowledgment of ambitions regarding "independence." [rendered in Ukrainian—samostiynost]

No, an historic event to eclipse the Council of Pereyaslavl has not happened. I suspect that the fraternization of two emerging bureaucracies of a democratic stripe has come about. I would be glad to be mistaken. However, they write from the republics to us at RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA that the latter-day guardians of the labor collectives are worse than the previous, ministerial ones, and that the guardians give them a shorter leash. As far as the guardians are concerned, the notion of the primary sovereignty of the producer of goods, accepted throughout the civilized world, is audacious and heretical.

Dizzying improvisations in the sphere of state building have occurred before the eyes of the astonished citizens of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Union republics. One is inclined to pinch himself: Could this entire mess be a dream? Where is it the case, in what country or state, that it is up to the federal authorities to issue laws, and it is the prerogative of "the field" to cancel them or to simply consider them entirely insignificant? This sacred postulate of populism is claimed to be the state of the art in sciences concerned with the state and the law and the cornerstone of the future federation. Not one of the certified lawyers who have had a hand in the innovations is blushing.

Simpler people also ask simple questions: Who empowered "the new democrats" to go for all of these risky and hazy improvisations involving their fortunes? Is there really a different, good intention involved here, apart from the obvious zeal to wrest more power from the "imperial" center? Soviet history has had an overabundance of improvisations which have caused us a lot of bitter tears. In general, totalitarianism is inclined to act rashly. I admit that I never imagined that the democratically elected parliaments and their leaders would carry on the willful mode of actions of their predecessors. While being very meticulous on the issues of procedure they display incredible haste when it comes to global decision. Indeed, if in the non-parliamentary parlance of Serpukhovskiy, in Russia "everything is going to the dogs" and is running wild once again, it is not only our exhausted economy, oppressed by militarization, and our poverty, which has suddenly been revealed to the world, that are to blame. A new phenomenon in politics, a boundless political frenzy of sorts is to blame for it to an even greater degree.

"Storm and onslaught"—this is the motto which, it appears, many plenipotentiary functionaries have deliberately adopted instead of the calculations and realism from which all civilized politicians in the world proceed in their endeavors and intentions.

Let us sidestep for now the issues of separatism, the great-power attitude, and nationalism giving our society a fever. We cannot say anything new or hopeful about this. Let us also sidestep the constitutional right of nations to self-determination. Nobody will dare to encroach on it. Let us turn to common sense, which none of the peoples lack. Let us ask all those who now crowd the arena of political life in the republics and those to whom millions of people listen credulously: Are they aware of where the road that they are now preparing to embark on unreservedly leads? Let us assume that the dream of statehood comes true immediately, tomorrow, and you are allowed to leave in peace. When the lights of the fireworks go out and mundane reality sets in, all the states will become concerned with feeding themselves. In the times of Catherine, the mundane sense of "independence" [rendered in Ukrainian—samostiynost] would have been as simple as could be: One went to the forest for logs and firewood; one went to the field with a wooden plow and a seeding machine; one went to the fair to swap barley for fabrics, and so on. There were no power, oil, or gas infrastructures, or production sharing with a multitude of sub-contractors, or the purchases of spare parts for imported equipment... Previously, Gosplan, this justifiably berated nondescript despot, gave a share from the community pot to every republic and distributed colossal streams of resources.

Freedom is what it is, but another Gosplan does not exist abroad. Their governments do not trade in oil and other goodies and do not issue delivery vouchers, as they explained to Mrs. Prunskiene in Oslo.

"Freedom is dearer than kerosene!" Perhaps, the people will agree to bear privation. However, how can you order steam generators at heat and power plants which need gas and fuel oil "to get by?" However, at times I get the impression that the ardent enthusiasts of the idea of state independence avoid philosophizing about all of these "infrastructures" and other annoying material details. By some sleight of hand, it turns out that for them the Union will sort of assume the obligation to finance the

overhead entailed by the isolation of their economies, running into the billions. They lose sight of the fact that from next year on the Soviet Union will be a market economy, and that its subjects, that is, producers, will not even consider delivering resources to anyone outside the boundaries of the USSR "in previous amounts," as the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet magnanimously promised to Lithuania on paper as soon as he took office. They will only sell for hard currency. If we do not soar in the clouds of national spirit but stand on our mother earth we can outline the entire scenario of demise of the economies of the separated states. It is a fact that after the fortunate completion of the cold war there are no more benevolent sponsors in the world for costly projects envisaging the creation of new states in Europe at a time when the old empires—France and Germany—are delegating some of their sovereignty to Strasburg in keeping with an agreement on the United States of Europe.

There is no intention of putting to shame the very idea of national sovereignty in this discourse which is not abstract, straightforward as it may be. This discourse merely appeals to the statesmanlike wisdom and experience of the world to which the populists are so fond of referring.

Is there a federal state anywhere in the world that consists of republics with unlimited sovereignty? Such a miracle is unheard of in both the Old and New World. However, every star on the flag of the United States stands for a truly sovereign state. Of course, it is not sovereign to such a degree that the authorities can issue a verdict on smoking out aliens from "our" state, as is now the custom in some places, for example, the numerous descendants of illegal immigrants from Mexico who, as I have been able to see, have established themselves well in the warm state of New Mexico, or clamp down on the Chinese in San Francisco who, while not being "indigenous," nonetheless serve on the bank boards of trustees and take control of the restaurant business as if nothing ever happened. They continue to infiltrate "the orange paradise," skillfully taking advantage of the absence of residential endorsement requirements.

Those among us who have on the tip of their tongues the resurrected notion "alien" will object to this by saying that the sovereignty of California is feeble and not genuine. Well, it is what it is, with a small dent in it, but, to make up for the dent, it is as full as it can be within the framework of the Jeffersonian Constitution which sets forth for all eternity that all people are created equal. I will repeat that the fullest sovereignty is that of a person, a citizen, a seller and a buyer, a craftsman, and an entrepreneur. A state as represented in the Congress and the government is not an orphan either. When Richard [as published] Reagan in Washington reduced the federal income tax rates another Richard, Governor Celeste of Ohio, willfully increased the state tax, having previously asked the citizens for their consent in a referendum. The State of Ohio did not even have to ask for the blessing of "the center." They were at cross-purposes in a most sensitive field, that of tax policies, and—note this—did not clash. These very separate responsibilities and the mutual acknowledgement of power prerogatives mean, as the pragmatic Americans see it, the true sovereignty of a territory and a polity which manages its own affairs without prompting from "on high." This is why, according to my observations, the governor is the leading figure for Americans, whereas the federal government is merely an assembly of clerks out there in Washington. However, they would go through hell or high water for the President. To be sure, they do fall out when the cities ask the President "to sustain them in their poverty," but the President appears not to hear. Supposedly, God will provide! However, I wish we had their problems instead of our home grown, soft-boiled "sovereignties."

At this point, a "nationally" thinking populist will immediately "expose" me. Who are these Americans—people without roots, footloose, wandering without a national hearth! However, do look at how the Italian community lives in Stamford, the Armenian community in California, or the Russian community in the backwoods of Oregon... You will see for yourself that they do remember where they have come from, and they have their own churches, altars, and hearths. To be sure, it is not their custom to smash their neighbor's altar.

I would still not cut with all my might the tight knot of economic relations which ties my republic to the giant continent of the USSR, even if I were a separatist to whom the idea of creating a nation state could eclipse the sun, and if for the sake of this objective I had to sacrifice everything that the civilized world holds dear, for example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. After all, this is the surest way to bring about the failure of the whole endeavor. Without jumping into the whirlpool to the sound of the cheerful saying "another day will come, and more food will appear," I will untwine these threads patiently one after another only after I have put in new threads tying me to the world economy, no matter how much time this handiwork takes. This may sound cynical, but if I were an adherent of national statehood I would act precisely in this manner rather than do something hurry-scurry. However, the point is that the people who want to dissolve our Union act hastily and nervously because they sense that this is their last chance! As market relations develop, the integration of the economy of the USSR with the countries of Western Europe (this may happen one day, and not just hypothetically) will deflate the idea of national statehood acquired "at any price" in the eyes of many sober-minded fellow citizens. This is why they act at present with reckless abandon, without having any degree of realistic economic support to back up their plans.

Why have populism and the sovereignty "syndrome" become such a rage in our country? Why do many people in the national republics think to themselves: What is so unrealistic about up and seceding if the learned people vouch that "it will not get any worse?"

Apparently, this has nothing to do with us being less able to think than the Teutons or the Gauls who merely shake their heads when they listen to us. Our trouble is that Stalinism put us on the shores of Freedom as naked and barefoot as the prince of Denmark. As is known, all that a poor man has to do to get on his way is to put his belt on. Almost none of us has an "anchor" at present which would make our mode of thinking and intentions more sedate and prudent. By that I mean property.

Why should I not try my luck if I am a hired hand who has put his shoulder to the wheel all my life for peanuts at a state enterprise or a state farm? The new "nation" state may be a more generous paymaster. If notions such as a market for sales, competition, export quotas, breach-of-contract penalties, winding down production, the price of a barrel of crude oil, and so on, or just the nagging concern about the sale of the fruits of one's labor were of any material significance in the real life of millions of people, these people would think a thousand times about the mountains of gold or, on the contrary, the privation and ruin which the dream of national statehood drummed into them at the end of the 20th century would entail. However, if these people are merely atoms in an electrified crowd at a rally, who do not have any notion of the realities of world economy, it is easy to inspire them to chase a pie in the sky for a short period of time.

Ironically, both the adherents of Stalinist "principles" and the national "democrats" staunchly advocate the state form of property, though to be sure, different modes of it. Persistent demands for the Center to hand over Union enterprises to national sovereignties in one fell swoop, so to say, from one balance sheet to another, have been heard from the Baltic area. They do not want to hear anything about turning these enterprises into joint-stock ventures whereby the entire labor collective becomes a co-owner. We get to hear instead the suspiciously familiar slogan, "The entire republic is one factory." This is a version of "barracks-style capitalism," but this time with national underpinnings, because a person who has acquired a couple of shares in his plant or has made a contribution to a dairy collective is no longer as pliable and ardent. He will have qualms about agreeing to the disintegration of the high-capacity Union market which is where his innermost interest also lies. It is more convenient for the nationalists to deal with a "dispossessed" crowd.

Therefore, on the one hand, there is nationalism and new totalitarianism, and on the other hand, a market economy which is closely intertwined with human rights. This dialectic is becoming ever more clearly visible before our eyes. This is where one needs to look for a hint of the shape of things to come.

Will we regain common sense now, at a turning point in the life of our country? Believers pray in churches: God, give us wisdom! All others say: Let us undertake something to stop the frenzy of mob rule, ensure accord, and rally around the president. Mikhail Gorbachev is the only one who remains a guarantor of moving toward a rule-of-law state. The civilized world is with us as long as Gorbachev remains in charge. The weight of his tremendous authority is on the scales. Still, we need to face the truth: Our society is going through one of the dangerous moments of its history which, perhaps, happen less frequently than once a century. We are sort of speeding along toward a narrow bottleneck on a mountain river full of rapids. Further downstream the river becomes wider and quieter. At present, two steps away from the raging bottleneck of the stream, centrifugal forces in our country have picked up so as to exceed centripetal forces. What are we to put our faith in? As I see it, only the pace of a market reform will take us from political vortexes to quiet waters. This applies in particular to the future of the Union treaty and a new federation of sovereign republics. This is how the issue stands: Either the privatization of property will outpace populist separatism, keep it in check, and civilize all of us, transforming us from a "mass" into a community of sovereign fellow citizens, or...

...The head of a commercial bank has complained that it is easier for him to open an office of his bank in Switzerland or Japan than in our Union republics. This is how zealously they uphold their "sovereignty." Will we really conduct our mutual settlements through Switzerland?

Higher Prices Threaten Paper's Survival

91UN0555B Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 90 p 1

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial board: "Our Position"]

[Text] Thus it turns out that according to the data of our publishing house, our newspaper may cease to exist by the summer of next year. There are serious intentions to jack up prices per ton of newsprint by a factor of six or more, although the expected increase was only by a factor of three (!). The communications and printing workers have already obtained what they want—their services have become sharply more expensive. Only the goose that lays the golden eggs has received nothing, not to use a stronger word. (Could this be a current state policy: to strangle the undesirable press by economic methods—all of it at once?) The honoraria which KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA pays for an entire issue amount to 550 rubles [R]. Sensations and information, cartoons and pictures, essays and reports are paid for in a purely symbolic manner. To be sure, we have now been authorized to increase honoraria, but from profits that just will not exist.

We could refrain from writing about these sensitive matters but many party and soviet publishers do not interpret as tragic the fact that the best journalists, professionals, people with integrity, are forced to leave

the leading newspapers of the country for any new publications that have elementary economic independence.

However, why talk about honoraria when ruin is at issue. The newspaper may be in danger of taking a loss of R113,642,900.

Even now our foreign staff correspondents are not receiving money for the maintenance of their offices in 1991. They may be threatened with unemployment, but the Soviet readers are threatened with a real "iron curtain" for information from abroad.

The newspaper is now being made to humiliate itself before the entire world—our state is really good at that. Meanwhile, in the five years of perestroyka alone KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has generated about R300 million of net profits for the CPSU Central Committee and in part for the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee.

In August we were asked to determine the subscription rate for our newspaper in 1991 and its volume—the number of issues per year. We were told: You are free, you are independent. To be sure, new prices for newsprint were only approximate at the time. Only predictions by specialists were available (more precisely, guesses). The editorial board of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA set the annual subscription rate at R13.80 per year. (This costs our readers even more than a PRAVDA subscription if we take into account the difference in volume). We decided to maintain the volume of our daily newspaper, which was small to begin with—300 issues a year. The VLKSM Central Committee Bureau supported our decision. The USSR Ministry of Communications accepted subscriptions to PRAVDA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and other publications.

In December, it came out that the August predictions of prices for newsprint had not been confirmed—there was an increase, and a huge one at that! Given the December prices, publishing newspapers in the USSR is becoming a losing proposition unless... Unless, of course, you have subsidies from mighty sponsors. However, being a newspaper that pursues an independent policy, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA does not have them at present...

We are not begging. We are recalling on behalf of millions of our subscribers: In 65 years, the publication of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has generated enormous funds for the party and VLKSM coffers.

Indeed, we are ready for the market, but for a civilized one in which the obligations of partners are honored. Alas, ruin may be in store for our newspaper, according to the data of our publishers. For our part, we await an answer from those who, having received millions from the subscribers, should now defend their interests.

We are categorically against increasing subscription rates yet again.

We are in favor of maintaining the 300-issue volume of our newspaper.

We would like to recall the following conclusion recently drawn by the CPSU Commission for the Issues of Youth Policy: Abandoning an idea and being carried away by commerce alone is tantamount to attempting suicide.

The CPSU will turn into an aging party if it stops thinking about the young people and their press. The CPSU Commission has made political decisions in support of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Will this political support become real?

[Signed] KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Editorial Board.

To Die Standing Tall or To Live on Our Knees?

—To set up a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA joint stock company? (All those who are prepared to invest their capital in the company are asked to contact the editorial office).
—To increase subscription rates because the money already paid by subscribers will last only until 1 July?
—To increase the share of advertisements in the newspaper sharply (to two pages) at the expense of other publications?
—To print "The Adventures of the Space Prostitute" and other "commercial" material in order to sell KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA at "commercial" prices?
—To ask for a subsidy from the CPSU Central Committee (or from some other party)?
—To demand the return of gigantic profits generated by the publication of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA prior to 1991?
—To await "humanitarian aid" from the West? To seek domestic sponsors (the Riga Bus Works? the Kama Automotive Works? the millionaire Tarasov?)?
—To demand the resignation of the government, which is incapable of counteracting exorbitant prices?
—To close down KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA effective 1 January as a publication operating at a loss, and to return the money to the subscribers?

P.S. However, other variants are also possible. As we were told by representatives of the "Sekai Nippo" publishing group (Tokyo), the newspaper EUROPEAN (London), the Russian service of Radio Liberty, and some other companies, there is a lot of interest in the Soviet information market, and an opportunity to acquire a controlling share of, for example, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is quite lucrative.

Sunday Press Delivery Suspension Discussed

91UN0555A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 90 p 1

[Article by S. Bobrovskiy: "Let Us Greet the New Year Without Newspapers!"]

[Text]

Telephone Message No 14-4/16 (E) Dated 19 December 1990

Contracts for 1991 between publishing houses and communications enterprises envisage that there will be no delivery of periodicals to subscribers on Sundays, including newspapers. Likewise, there will be no delivery on the days of state holidays declared to be days off.

[Signed] USSR Deputy Minister of Communications Manyakin.

Point of View

V. Chikin, editor in chief of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, member of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, member of the CPSU Central Committee:

I remember very well the shock caused by a paper-saving campaign mounted 10 or 15 years ago when they yanked out the "unnecessary" pages of newspapers and the "unnecessary" sheets of magazines. Despite the fact that by now the people have become used to a multitude of shortages, the readers have not been able to recover from this campaign to this day: They believe they have been shortchanged, and, essentially, they are right.

At present, steps are being taken to reduce the publication of dailies from six to five times per week on the pretext of the same paper shortage and for the sake of a more rational conduct of editorial operations. I am convinced that the newspapers which are subjected to this will no longer deserve to be called dailies. This is simply absurd at a time when the politization of our life is such that it would be proper to publish extra issues, as was the case in the years of the revolution or in the time of war.

Still more questions arise if we look at the arguments being made now from an economic point of view. If we introduce two days off per week we will disrupt the operating schedules of the printing plants. To my mind, it is strange to raise the issue of how we can rest more in the course of a transition to market relations instead of the issue of how we can make more money. I believe that both the working class and the organizers of production are interested primarily in using the printing capacities more efficiently. It appears to me that this will enable the editorial offices to come to an agreement with the publishing houses and the workers themselves, even if our founders will not take a favorable view of this.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Investigates

From reliable sources. The production of newsprint is concentrated under the control of several TsBK's [Pulp and Paper Combines]. Last year deliveries were made at an average price of 257 rubles [R] per ton. Alarming rumors concerning a price increase by one order of magnitude in 1991 (from hundreds to thousands of rubles) are not unfounded. Under a government resolution dated 25 October 1990, these prices are now contractual—that is, freely set—and this freedom is not restricted by any anti- monopoly measures. The CPSU Publishing House PRAVDA has already signed a contract with the Uglegorsk Pulp and Paper Plant for the delivery of newsprint at R1,724 per ton. It is quite possible that other TsBK's will demand equally exorbitant terms.

Witness testimony. V.V. Smirnov, a deputy subdepartment chief at the State Committee for Prices, believes that a 30-percent profitability margin set by the government for the newsprint producers cannot restrict the growth of prices. The state has been "saving" on the pulp and paper industry far too long. At any rate, the striving of the TsBK's to solve the accumulated problems, this time at the expense of the consumer, is understandable. However, in the opinion of Vasiliy Valeryevich, in principle the figure R1,800 may turn out to be "inflated" and needs to be verified carefully. He also believes that a contraction of the domestic market for newsprint can hardly be compensated by an expansion in the foreign market in which the price will most likely drop when supply increases. This is what the newsprint producers should keep in mind as they bring about the ruin of their domestic partners.

S.I. Timofeyeva, chief of the sector of price setting in the Minlesprom [Ministry of the Timber Industry], communicated that according to her calculations, at current world-market prices expressed in our "wooden" (rather than hard-currency) money, R840 is the maximum of what the paper industry can count on. Therefore, the West will not help them if Soviet newspapers stop buying newsprint at a loss to themselves.

At the same time, the paper industry people are in a difficult situation themselves: Prices for the main raw materials (timber in the round, saw logs) are going up by a factor of three (but not eight!—KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editor's note).

The first version. The supposition that the pulp-and-paper monopolies have resolved to strangle glasnost by the bony hand of a newsprint famine is not very likely (although it deserves to be worked on some more). If the newspapers are the first ones to die, the TsBK's will be the next in line. They will hardly manage "to profit" by this operation.

The second version. Having come to the brink of bankruptcy, the editorial collectives themselves will apparently be forced to either pass on the higher prices or ask their publishers and sponsors for subsidies. As far as KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is concerned, it appears that only the government or the party funds are capable of offsetting its expected loss—R113 million.

Rumors of Fire at Leningrad AES Refuted

914E0040A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 21 Dec 90 p 1

[Article by V. Kokosov: "Fire at the Nuclear Power Plant?"]

[Text] Leningrad—Very alarming rumors have been making the rounds of Leningrad for some days: A fire and release of radiation supposedly took place at the electric power station at Sosnovyy Bor. But what really happened?

As usual, the rumors have turned out to be exaggerated. Some smoke was observed in a ventilation shaft outlet of the building of the second power unit of the Leningrad AES [nuclear electric power station]. An employee in the commandant's office reported it to the fire fighting unit in Sosnovyy Bor, and from there a signal was sent to Leningrad.

The alarm was raised. Significant forces of fire fighters prepared to respond. However it soon turned out that there was no need for aid. Literally within 30 minutes the personnel at the nuclear power station had put out the fire themselves.

The explanation for the fire was that a piece of plastic compound for covering the floor, left behind by the builders, caught fire because of the high temperature of a panel. There were no injuries and no equipment was shut down; the reactor remained at full capacity. Thus, nothing significant happened at the Leningrad AES.

Economic

Silayev-Textile Worker Talks Ease Tension

914F0089A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 12 Dec 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Spirit of Constructive Dialogue"]

[Text] The explosive situation in the textile and light industry in Russia was defused somewhat by the negotiations held on Monday between representatives of the branch trade union and I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers.

The motivation for this meeting was the presentation of an ultimatum by the Russian trade union last week to the authorities of the republic and the country, which summed up the demands to overcome the crisis in the branch and create a mechanism for the social protection of the workers during the transition to market relations. A deadline was also given for the ultimatum: before 15 December. Otherwise the trade union coordination council intended to follow the will of the labor collectives and call a two-hour warning strike on 17 December, the day of the opening of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

But the matter did not go that far. I.S. Silayev assured the participants in the meeting that the Russian Government was in a position to significantly change the situation in the textile and light industry. Even in the next few days decrees will be published, pertaining, in particular, to the technical retooling of enterprises, the delivery of raw material under conditions that are mutually acceptable to industry and agriculture, and higher wages for workers of the branch.

At the same time, as was noted at the meeting, certain problems in light industry, for example, those related to the purchase of imported raw materials and improvements in price setting, could be resolved only at the Union level. The trade union coordination council reserved the right to take collective actions in the event that the Union Government did not pay attention to the socioeconomic demands of the workers and did not take resolute measures to bring the branch out of the crisis.

Urals Establishment Switches To Making Computers

PM2812113590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Dec 90

[Report by S. Sergeyev, G. Kononov from Chelyabinsk Oblast; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Two years ago the country's leadership announced from the UN rostrum a large-scale conversion of the Soviet economy. A year later it became obvious that the planned conversion was in trouble. Of 400 enterprises earmarked for conversion, only five or six have been fully converted. Efforts to start up the production of technologically and technically totally incompatible output which has been foisted on enterprises have swallowed up more than 7 billion rubles from the state budget over the past two years and unknown sums of enterprises' own money.

So if you hear that somewhere conversion is progressing more or less normally, you immediately ask correspondents to report on this. Here is a reportage from Chelyabinsk Oblast.

[Sergeyev] In the southern Urals conversion has affected not only defense industry plants but also scientific institutes which formerly worked solely for the country's military-industrial complex. The until recently the top secret All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Technical Physics, which is located in the closed city of Chelyabinsk-70, is now offering its products—personal computers—to anyone who wants to buy them.

This equipment for which there is a great need in the Urals, and which is still in short supply, is manufactured by "Sungul"—a scientific and engineering center set up on the basis of the institute. And although the price of the computers is relatively high, clients frequently turn

down the offers of the "Sungul" center's competitors. Serious consumers seek a serious supplier, I was told. The rule followed here is strict observance of the contract terms for the manufacture and delivery of equipment. Service facilities are available under guarantee for a period of one year, and technical servicing is available for the next five to six years if desired. Center specialists can provide software and equip the computers with special devices preventing leakage of classified information, which are necessary in some cases. Consumers are also readily making use of specialist training for personal computer operators which is available at the center's training base.

This equipment is now in operation at the Sverdlovsk "Uralmash" Plant, the Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Combine, the Chelyabinsk "Traktornyy Zavod" Association, and the "Chelyabenergo." This output is also known beyond the Urals. Computers produced as a result of the conversion of military industry have been delivered to 130 of the country's cities from the Baltic Republics to the Far East.

Defense Industry Conversion Goods Exhibited

PM2812102590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 21 Dec 90

[Report by S. Vetoshkin from Vladimir Oblast; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] There is no more important task in our country at the moment than the swiftest possible saturation of the market with high-grade consumer goods. Defense industry enterprises with their powerful high-tech and intellectual potential have a substantial contribution to make here.

[Vetoshkin] We are the first television crew to be admitted with a camera to this enterprise today—the Murom Instrument-Building Plant in Vladimir Oblast.

With the startup of conversion very active efforts have been made here to initiate the production of consumer goods, among other articles. The resourcefulness and inventiveness displayed in this process deserves a mention, in my opinion.

[N.Ye. Kotorov, deputy chief engineer] So as to have no problems in marketing our goods, we try to produce goods with unique consumer qualities. Take for instance this "Blik" lamp. A small capsule inside a crystal shell gives off light for five hours.

[Vetoshkin] Five hours?

[Kotorov] Yes, five hours in actual fact. Or take our latest new product—the [?"Liven"] washing machine. It is also based on an original design. Water jets created by the agitator lift the washing, thus virtually doing away with friction and consequently also mechanical damage to the washing.

[Vetoshkin] And this unique assembly is enough to make any youngster's eyes gleam with joy. It consists of 300 parts, mainly sturdy aluminum tubing, which can be used to build 25 different scooters, carts, and pedal vehicles.

[Kotorov] As you have been able to see, we are now producing all these goods in the main production shops. This is very inconvenient, of course, and inefficient. We are planning in the near future to set up independent production units. We will create small enterprises which will make it possible to produce high-grade goods with maximum returns, using our high-tech potential.

[Vetoshkin] And in conclusion a small New Year's gift for television viewers. We will now light these sparklers. You can see they are multicolored—red, green.... Can you imagine how beautifull they will be on the New Year's tree. Incidentally, this is also a completely new product as far as our country is concerned.

International Investment Bank Protocol Signed

LD2112113290 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 21 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow Dec 21 TASS—The International Investment Bank's board decided at its extraordinary meeting, which ended here on Thursday, to approve the concept for the bank's operation in light of changing all its credit transactions to hard currency as of January 1, 1991.

The bank will continue, as before, to finance joint investment programmes and the construction of nationally important projects.

A protocol was signed during the meeting to amend the agreement on the bank's inauguration and its charter. Other countries and interstate economic organisations may be admitted to the bank as members. The bank retains its status as an intergovernment organisation. Financial and bank organisations will take part in the bank's activities on the basis of their status, determined by the board.

The meeting was attended by delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, USSR, Czechoslovakia, and also representatives of the CMEA Secretriat and the International Bank for Economic Cooperation.

Scientific

Cosmos 2120 Satellite Launched 26 Dec

LD2712081690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0803 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)—An artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-2120, which is carrying scientific apparatus for space research, was launched by a Soyuz booster rocket in the USSR on Wednesday, it is reported today.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution, 88.6 mins; apogee, 253 km; perigee, 188 km; orbital inclination, 82.6 deg.

The satellite is also carrying a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to Earth data about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus. The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

Raduga-1 Communications Satellite Launched

LD2812083490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0806 GMT 28 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow, 28 Dec (TASS)—The "Raduga-1" communication satellite was launched in the USSR by the "Propon" rocket-carrier on Thursday [27 December]. The satellite carries multichannel relay equipment providing for the further expansion of telephone and telegraph radiocommunication on USSR territory.

The satellite was placed into an orbit close to the stationary, with the following parameters:

- Distance from the earth's surface—36,535 kilometers;
- period of revolution—24 hours 34 minutes;
- orbital inclination—1.4 degrees.

The satellite equipment is functioning normally.

Military

Nuclear Test Resumption in Kazakhstan Denied

LD2712204190 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] A spokesman for the parliamentary committee for the environment in Kazakhstan has denied media reports that nuclear arms tests will resume at the Semipalatinsk test site in his republic. He said the reply of the Soviet Defense Council to their inquiry unequivocally states there have been no decisions on the continuation of tests in Semipalatinsk.

Moiseyev Comments on New Military Service Law

LD2612223190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Dec 90

["Comment" by Mikhail Alekseyevich Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff and USSR deputy defense minister, on the USSR draft laws on universal military duty and military service, to an unidentified correspondent; on 26 December, place not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Moiseyev] The first of these laws is the law on universal military duty and military service, and the second is on the status of servicemen. I think that both laws are in line with the spirit of the times today and that their adoption will help our servicemen to find their place in the system of the state.

There are various interesting aspects elaborated in this law, such as the deferment of the draft and the voluntary undertaking of military service; there are also a number of articles concerning release from military service and the procedure for directing someone into nonmilitary service. These are new acts stemming from the demands of the time.

The draft existing now from, say, spring and fall of this year... [Moiseyev changes thought] in spite of the fact that the draft is announced by decision of the government, just as it used to be by order of the defense minister, we see that this decision is not effective in some republics.

[Correspondent] It envisages universal military training. How will this look in practice?

[Moiseyev] Do you mean in the country as a whole?

[Correspondent] Yes.

[Moiseyev] At present we do not have any initial military training. We have physical education. The emphasis must be on physical education. A person who has reached the age of 17 should be, should become, at the very least a physically strong person who can carry out difficult, heavy, army service.

The second law is on the status of servicemen. In general this law forced us to do a considerable amount of work and come forward with this proposal. It concerns decisions on social questions, on a large range of social questions, all those which have any connection with the army, those people who doing their military service, those who have completed their service and have been discharged into the reserve, those who are in the reserve, or those who have completed their service and completely retired on a pension, this law on the status of servicemen concerns them all.

[Correspondent] In your view, what will this provide for the Armed Forces, to improve their combat readiness and all that is connected with the Armed Forces, the Navy and everything?

[Moiseyev] At the least, these two laws guarantee everything from the procedure of entering the service to the norms of protecting and guaranteeing the serviceman.

Internal Troops' Komsomol Congress Starts

LD2512065190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 25 Dec 90

[Text] Today the congress of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations of the Internal Troops is starting. Its participants will speak about the problems related to the activities of this subdivision of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, including the guarding of prisons, colonies, and service at hot

spots. Yesterday, the delegates to the congress met with Pugo, the country's minister of foreign affairs, who recenlty assumed that post.

PRAVDA Roundtable Views Defense Conversion

91UM0195A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Dec 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report on PRAVDA roundtable discussion prepared by I. Mosin and A. Pokrovskiy: "USSR-United States: A Conversion Rendezvous?"]

[Text] **As we have already reported, a roundtable discussion took place in the PRAVDA editorial offices among representatives of Soviet and American business circles involved in the military-industrial complexes of their countries. The purpose of the meeting was to exchange opinions on the problems of conversion. Participating in the discussion, along with "pure" production workers, were scholars, financial experts, businessmen, and representatives of state management organs.**

Naturally there was also discussion of more general problems: cooperation between the countries and ways of overcoming economic, social, and political difficulties in the USSR. It is especially important that in a lively, direct exchange both sides gained a better understanding of one another's positions, tried to find points of agreement, and helped to get rid of illusions to a certain extent. We should like to emphasize that world experience in conversion shows—and those participating in the meeting were unusually unanimous about this—that this process is an objectively costly measure in its initial stage. And it must be approached with a good deal of circumspection.

A. KISILEV, director of the Machinebuilding Plant Imeni Khrunichev:

Our enterprise produces proton missiles and orbital stations. If we understand the technical side of conversion—it consists in halting the output of protons and reducing the number of orders in the interests of the Academy of Sciences and increasing the output of consumer goods—then this process is not proceeding in a very organized way from the standpoint of legislation.

I know that the United States has these problems as well: We recently met at a conference on conversion in Boston.

First of all, we are all bothered by questions of social protection. Unfortunately we do not have a law on conversion yet, although we participated in its development and it was discussed in the Presidential Council, but it has not been adopted yet.

What does this lead to? As I have already said, we have halted the output of proton missiles, and this means a number of experimental design projects as well, after which a total of about 30 million rubles' [R] worth of production was left uncompleted. And now we are running back and forth between the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Finance because we have to pay very large fines for this "incomplete production."

The second problem is that no compensation has been envisioned for defense enterprises when changing over to the output of new products, even in the form of releasing us from paying taxes for a couple of years. And, finally, the production of consumer goods is the state order for us and we are not allowed to reject economically disadvantageous products. At the same time this order is not backed up by reliable material and technical support. And these comprise 90 percent of our orders. How are we to enter a market economy under these conditions?

It is as though they have blindfolded enterprises of the defense complex and bound their hands and feet and then said: Enter the free market. And then we will be surprised at how a powerful technical potential can be destroyed in such a short period of time.

This is why I wish to take advantage of this occasion to remind people, perhaps to the dissatisfaction of our government and Supreme Soviet, of the need to accelerate the adoption of a law on conversion and on the state enterprise. So far the legislation does not inspire optimism. In particular, I cannot understand the ukase of the president concerning foreign economic activity. Yes, it pursues the goal of paying the debts, but at the same time it suppresses the development of the financial and economic independence of the enterprises. And this could be costly.

In conclusion, I would like to ask our U.S. colleagues about this point of confusion. Our enterprise has been visited by many U.S. delegations recently. Matlock, the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, and his wife were even there. We showed our guests everything that interested them. But when we were in America we were not shown a single space rocket enterprise. So far the exchange has been in only one direction.

A. GERASHCHENKO, first deputy minister of the aviation industry:

Conversion in our country is proceeding in two main directions—maximum growth of the production of passenger aircraft and helicopters and growth of the output of equipment for the light and food industry and medical equipment. But we are still relying mainly on increasing the production and improving the quality of passenger vehicles.

The demand for passenger aircraft is growing throughout the world. Speaking with leaders of U.S. firms we learned that they alone are not able to solve the problem of passenger transportation throughout the world. Even with the Soviet Union included, apparently, it would be impossible to cover the demand predicted today for the year 2000. Therefore we have several suggestions.

Today we are becoming increasingly familiar with the aviation industry of our two countries through exchanges

of delegations and participation in international aviation shows. People might ask where the concrete results are. In the first place, in order to initiate cooperation in trade and in joint enterprises, we must get to know one another better. In the second place, certain practical steps have been taken. Thus our firm, which is headed by general designer Simonov, has begun to work with the U.S. firm Gulfstream Aerospace on creating a supersonic aircraft. Several conferences have been held with a group of U.S. specialists headed by Mr. Hammer. We are speaking about joint production of our latest modifications of the IL-96 and TU-204 aircraft with engines produced by British and American companies and American equipment.

It seems to me that this is the way we should work. Many suggestions have accumulated. We produce the largest AN-225 aircraft—the Mriya, and the helicopter with the largest handling capacity—the Mi-26, and now U.S. firms are developing proposals for ways in which we can work together to produce and operate them throughout the world.

On the whole, in order to solve the problem of air transportation before the year 2000, perhaps it will be necessary to divide up the manufacture of certain types of aircraft in our countries. We could specialize in the production of individual systems in order to increase the output and make everything more accessible to the consumer in terms of price.

But to carry out conversion with the greatest effectiveness it is necessary, of course, to have capital investments. American, Japanese, and British firms are offering to create a hard currency fund for conversion in the Soviet Union. All the defense branches have made suggestions regarding this. Soon a group of specialists will come from America, Japan, England, and France in order to determine the policy for 20 enterprises that have been harmed by conversion in which this hard currency could be invested most expediently.

[PRAVDA] Will you find jobs for the people released during the course of conversion in some other production or will you simply let them go?

[Gerashchenko] We are trying not to let go of specialists and to use them for increasing the output of civilian aircraft and also consumer goods.

V. NIKIPELOV, first deputy minister of atomic energy and industry

Listening to today's speeches I came to the conclusion that many difficulties in mutual understanding arise from the fact that conversion of the defense industry has specific features in our two countries just as the organization of control does. We should exchange opinions more frequently in order to understand one another better.

For us conversion means reduction of the previous production volumes by 30 percent. That is, this is a deep conversion. And one of the main tasks is to avoid losing people, to provide jobs for them, and at the same time to preserve the social benefits they now enjoy. And yet along with the reduction of the production volume there is a decline in profit, which means a reduction in the filling of various social funds.

Qualified personnel are not the only base for conversion in our country. It also includes tens of thousands of square meters of production space, released infrastructure, equipment, and so forth. It also includes the branch's scientific and technical potential. We have at our disposal a number of technologies whose use will produce a very great advantage for the production of goods for the national economy.

This means goods not only for the Soviet Union, but also for the foreign market. For this is the only way—on the basis of mutual advantage—that it is possible for us to receive the foreign investments we need.

It turns out that our countries together have already created the largest nuclear industry in the world. Therefore we must both pay a certain price in order to restore those territories which have been polluted as a result of these actions. And this is also a joint task.

And in conclusion—one suggestion. Perhaps we should organize a permanent expert center which would consider proposals for the creation of joint enterprises on the basis of mutually advantageous technology. I would like to have an organization which would operate continuously and productively in the area of conversion.

V. LISICHSKIN, USSR Academy of Sciences:

It is clear to all of us that the process is irreversible. And at the same time we are faced with a multitude of common problems. I would like to name a number of sources of investments which would help.

It seems to me that we should proceed from direct orders from American enterprises to Soviet firms of the military and industrial complex and vice versa. We already have a number of orders from American firms for the manufacture, for example, of multilayer circuit boards for electronics, press forms, and so forth. We have placed these specific orders at enterprises of the military and industrial complex. These direct orders are in no way linked to the existence of special legislative acts on conversion.

Another way is to create joint enterprises of private U.S. firms and Soviet military plants. And vice versa—between Soviet civilian enterprises and American military plants.

And, finally, nothing is keeping us from creating joint companies with limited liability on the basis of military plants of the Soviet Union. But bank support is needed here. And I suggest that at today's meeting we adopt a decision to create an American-Soviet investment bank whose founders would be not only American companies,

but also Soviet military enterprises. I am prepared on behalf of our scientific production association Prognostika to make the first contribution to the creation of such a bank.

My next suggestion is to make meetings like today's a regular thing and also to create an American data bank on converted enterprises.

R. CELESTE, governor of the State of Ohio:

On the one hand, the president and the congress want to significantly reduce expenditures on military production. But on the other hand, they do not want the negative consequences this reduction could cause. First of all, unemployment. We have an internal dilemma: how to reduce expenditures and at the same time maintain the level of employment.

We have no simple or clear solutions to this problem. For example, in my State of Ohio we have great capacities for producing tanks for the Defense Department. We have 10,000 workers producing them. And there are no alternative kinds of products that could be produced at this production facility. That is, the technology is such that it is impossible to produce anything other than tanks. Conversion has turned into a major problem for them. There is no guarantee that they will be able to find work. And the administration's main task is to find new jobs for the workers who were released. This is a very complicated political problem. And I am afraid that we do not have a universal answer that will work with all cases in life.

Last year we wasted $6 billion in Ohio on production under military contracts. But there is one peculiarity: Two-thirds of this sum was spent at enterprises which employ about 100 people or less. These are small enterprises. With the help of the development of small enterprises it is possible to carry out conversion more flexibly and effectively. It is easier to restructure them for the output of civilian products and they are more mobile.

In the larger perspective the current stage of development shows that producers of defense products should also be large suppliers of civilian products. Here is an illustration: General Electric is an enterprise which produces engines for combat vehicles. It also produces engines for civilian aircraft. Therefore it is much easier to convert it. If it halts production of combat vehicles, it will be able to shift its work force to the production of civilian aircraft.

If we take small contractors who produce only a certain kind of metal for military needs, it will be more difficult for them. They will have to find some kinds of new products and obtain contracts for producing them from other clients. Therefore we are trying to work with small enterprises in order to determine how their technologies, their skills, and their capabilities can be used for production for which there is a civilian market.

Many small enterprises are naturally interested in creating joint enterprises in the Soviet Union and in other countries as well. But they need a quick return. They cannot allow themselves to conduct lengthy negotiations. Therefore in order for American businessmen to rush to the Soviet market, it must be ready to meet them. That is, the Soviet side must solve an entire complex of political, economic, and social problems.

The first question is the convertibility of the ruble. This is a question of how to obtain income from joint production. The second question is whose money will be subjected to the greatest risk. If, for example, American companies invest dollars or hard currency, they will want to have certain guarantees of its security. At the present time there is no mechanism which would provide for security and guarantees for foreign capital. The third problem is to convince the government to give most-favored-nation status to business with the USSR.

To be more concrete, I think we must arrange cooperation in joint work on certain projects. The products should go to two markets—the USSR and the international. In think there are many small enterprises in the U.S. defense sector which would be very interested in using their capacities for joint production. But I would like to emphasize that conversion requires very large capital investments. This is a very costly affair. And we must be prepared to make large capital investments if we want to obtain any return and not simply shut down production.

M. WICKER, chairman of the board of the Millburn Corporation:

I have no doubt that an immense intellectual, production, and raw material potential is concentrated in the USSR. But I agree with my colleagues that it can be manifested only with the correct political decisions directed toward the development of a market economy.

We should not be deluded about the wealth of certain countries. There is a large shortage of capital in general at the world level. There is no doubt that the Soviet Union will have to engage in a struggle to obtain this capital. I have no doubt that if the necessary conditions are created the capital will flow to you. Such is its nature. I recall that in 1905 when reforms were being conducted in Russia, businessmen from Europe and the United States began to invest their money in your economy.

At the present time in America there are entire projects for research and development of petroleum and gas in the northern regions and the area of Sakhalin Island. There is no doubt that this is commercial business.

But the businessmen need guarantees that they will receive their profit, that they will be able to dispose of it at their own discretion, and that nobody will expropriate their capital. Possibly it would be worthwhile to link these guarantees to guarantees that could be granted by international courts. This would provide for a sufficient level of conditions to develop joint projects.

Another purely practical problem is related to the problem of communications and ties with the USSR. When we were in Leningrad it took me several days to get in contact with my office. Leningrad is right next door to Finland. It would be very easy to establish reliable communications with Finland and from there, with the rest of the world. Communications must be task number one. And then the capital investments will come in.

Another thing. I do not think that the protocol on the intentions in the United States is of any significance for Soviet entrepreneurs. I must say that many Americans are very cynical about that protocol of intentions. There is a joke that 70 protocols were signed concerning the intentions for one and the same project.

It is necessary to introduce an element of responsibility when protocols are signed. Of course, there are limitations of a certain kind. From the standpoint of the capitals, we are all waiting impatiently for business proposals which will enable us to conduct advantageous joint business.

S. FEIN, retired admiral, businessman:

When I was in the military I lived in one world. Now I live in a different one, the business world. And my third world is the academic one—where I deliver lectures. I can speak to you from the standpoint of small entrepreneurs.

I do not know of a bank in the United States which could compare to the state bank and which would conduct business transactions with the Soviet Union. There are banks which have been established in the United States by Israel, Spain, Great Britain, and Japan, and these banks are owned by these countries. But, alas, we have no Soviet bank. But such a bank could attract American businessmen to advantageous economic transactions. I suggest that you buy an American bank and create possibilities of conducting such operations.

Second. Where are the Soviet lobbyists in the American Congress? Every nation I know of with which the United States maintains business relations and even those with which we do not maintain these contacts have their lobbyists in Washington. They are working in Congress in the interests of their businessmen. That is how we do business. I ask once again: Where are your lobbyists? Where are the Soviet trading companies? If there are none, who will represent and defend your interests in America? There are many ways of establishing such companies in the United States. A clear example is provided by the Japanese companies. They are very active in our market. We have tried to do the same thing in Japan, but unfortunately we have not been able to compete as successfully. This is precisely how they enter the American economy and exert great efforts to establish themselves and expand their spheres of influence.

All these questions are very important for doing business. I give this advice: If, for example, you want to buy an American bank, you could get one cheap now because the banking business in the United States is experiencing hard times now.

V. GUBAREV, leader of the roundtable discussion, PRAVDA science editor:

Conversion is a symbol of our time. It is a change to a principally new way of life not only in our countries but throughout the world. I have no doubt that the efforts of the USSR and the United States in the area of conversion should be unified. In the name of and for the good of all mankind. And it is no accident that a number of space industry and atomic energy enterprises and institutions of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which just yesterday were actively working to produce arms, today have actively engaged in the program "Space—For the Children" that is being conducted by the joint stock company "Neizvestnyy Kosmodrom" about which we are writing in our newspaper. We invite everyone who wishes to join in our projects.

It is understandable that in today's report we were able to reflect only the main ideas expressed by Soviet and American participants in the roundtable discussion because it continued for several hours. Some of the concrete proposals were left in the stenographic notes on which both sides are still working, and some were submitted to the editors in the form of theses of speeches that were not presented because of time constraints.

"It seems to me," the head engineer of the Yuzhpolimetall Production Association, V. Khabarov, expresses his own opinion, "that the main question for the Americans is whether or not it is possible to do business with these crazy Russians." And he answers it himself by listing a number of areas of conversion in which the association could cooperate with the Americans in various forms.

The theses of the general director of the Vympel Central Scientific Production Association were also filled with business proposals. "Conversion in the USSR," he writes, "gives us a unique chance to radically change views on military and technical competition by working together in our intention to make joint use of the achievements of the military-industrial complex both in the USSR and the United States in the interests of military-political and economic stabilization." And he goes on to make concrete proposals in the area of communications.

On this side of our roundtable, the desire to move from talks to action was emphasized in the speech by CPSU Central Committee Secretary O. Baklanov. He noted that the high rate of conversion in our country is causing considerable expenditures from the standpoint of social protection of the workers of the converted enterprises. And here we can be helped by the pragmatic approach of the American side to solving the problems that arise. Another difficulty is the preservation and development with the output of consumer goods of the technical level that was reached with the output of arms.

We still must add that the American delegation visited a number of enterprises of our defense complex, including the plant imeni Khrunichev. And there too there was a business discussion of quite concrete issues and proposals. Our guests promised to inform interested American businessmen about them. We shall hope that the state of "protocols about intentions" has passed. The time has come to sign contracts for cooperation.

Baltic Republics

Baltic National Equality Resolution Published

91UN0510A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 5 Dec 90 p 6

[Resolution signed for the Latvian Republic by A. Gorbunovs, Supreme Soviet chairman; for the Lithuanian Republic by V. Landsbergis, Supreme Soviet chairman; and for the Estonian Republic by A. Ruutel, Supreme Soviet chairman; in Vilnius on 1 December: "Resolution on National Equality"]

[Text] We, members of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Republic, the Lithuanian Republic, and the Estonian Republic, at a joint meeting express our resolve to provide for the observance of the rights of all people living in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, regardless of their nationality, native language, and political and religious convictions, in keeping with international legal protection documents and also with the laws of our states and in keeping with these laws and sublegal acts of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We confirm our unchanging aspiration to improve our state structures so they will reliably provide for the protection of the rights of all ethnic communities residing in our states and contribute to respect for the culture and customs of people of various nationalities.

We call upon all national communities to actively contribute to the development of democratic institutions which would become the basis for the general well-being and progress in the independent Baltic states.

[Signed] Chairmen of the joint meeting:
from the Latvian Republic
A. Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
from the Lithuanian Republic
V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
from the Estonian Republic
A. Ruutel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
Vilnius, 1 December 1990

Baltics Issue Appeal on USSR Troop Presence

91UN0510B Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 5 Dec 90 p 6

[Appeal signed for the Latvian Republic by A. Gorbunovs, Supreme Soviet chairman; for the Lithuanian Republic by V. Landsbergis, Supreme Soviet chairman; and for the Estonian Republic by A. Ruutel, Supreme Soviet chairman; in Vilnius on 1 December: "Appeal to the Population of the Baltic Republics and Soviet Military Servicemen"]

[Text] We, members of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Republic, the Lithuanian Republic, and the Estonian Republic, having gathered at a joint meeting in the capital of the Lithuanian Republic, the city of Vilnius, declare:

The USSR troops on the territory of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian Republics are a remnant of the aggression of the Soviet Union against the Baltic states. Therefore the struggle of our peoples for the removal of the Soviet troops is inseparable from their struggle for complete restoration of state independence. Soviet military servicemen in the Baltic countries have become like hostages of the continuing imperialist policy.

At the same time we do not regard each officer and soldier in the Soviet forces and members of their families as personal enemies of our peoples.

We think that peaceful dialogue, which requires patience, opens up greater possibilities than harsh, albeit justified, accusations at the gates of the barracks.

While demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops, we will do nothing that would impeach the dignity and human rights of the military servicemen and their family members. At the same time we cannot take responsibility for and guarantee the satisfaction of the material and social needs of the influx of military servicemen and their families who are not controlled by our states.

We are in favor of negotiations to determine the status of the contingent of USSR Armed Forces temporarily stationed on the territory of the Baltic states on the basis of international legal practice.

We call for USSR military servicemen to observe the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of our countries, to respect our laws, and oppose attempts to use the Army against the peaceful population.

[Signed] Chairmen of the joint meeting:
from the Latvian Republic
A. Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
from the Lithuanian Republic
V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
from the Estonian Republic
A. Ruutel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
Vilnius, 1 December 1990

Baltics Appeal to USSR People's Deputies

91UN0510C Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 5 Dec 90 p 6

[Appeal signed for the Latvian Republic by A. Gorbunovs, Supreme Soviet chairman; for the Lithuanian Republic by V. Landsbergis, Supreme Soviet chairman; and for the Estonian Republic by A. Ruutel, Supreme Soviet chairman; in Vilnius on 1 December: "Appeal of the Supreme Soviets of the Latvian Republic, the Lithuanian Republic, and the Estonian Republic to the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] We, members of the Supreme Soviets of the Latvian Republic, the Lithuanian Republic, and the Estonian Republic, having gathered in the capital of the Lithuanian Republic, the city of Vilnius, have resolved to adopt the following appeal:

Based on the historical right of our peoples and guided by their will, the Supreme Soviets of the Latvian Republic, the Lithuanian Republic, and the Estonian Republic have adopted decrees on the restoration of the independence of their states.

We have proposed to the Supreme Soviet and the leaders of the USSR to begin negotiations on the recognition of the state independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, but our repeated proposals have not found the proper response. Moreover, the USSR leaders are attempting to block trade and economic ties between our states and the republics of the USSR and to destabilize the economies of the Baltic states.

We are convinced that only under conditions of independent management, close cooperation, and good neighborly relations will we be able not only to advance our economy but also contribute to the elimination of crisis phenomena in the Soviet Union.

At the same time we confirm that the Latvian Republic, the Lithuanian Republic, and the Estonian Republic will not participate in the preparation and signing of a Union treaty. We categorically object to attempts to force the Baltic states to sign a Union treaty through economic pressure and the threat of the application of military force.

We are against the Soviet military presence on the territory of the Latvian, Lithuania, and Estonian Republics and the intervention of the USSR Armed Forces in the internal affairs of our states. We think that, until USSR troops are completely withdrawn, their status, including social support for military servicemen and their families, should be determined by interstate agreements between our countries and the USSR.

We propose that the USSR recognize the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and in the shortest possible time begin interstate negotiations to establish political and economic relations between the Baltic states and the USSR.

[Signed] Chairmen of the joint meeting:
from the Latvian Republic
[signed] A. Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
from the Lithuanian Republic
[signed] V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
from the Estonian Republic
[signed] A. Ruutel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet
Vilnius, 1 December 1990

Deputies Call Appeal 'Political Provocation'

91UN0510D Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 5 Dec 90 p 6

["Declaration" by Baltic deputies]

[Text] We, deputies of the Supreme Soviets of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republics], representing the interests of more than 2 million USSR citizens living in the Baltic area, think that today's measure is a political provocation directed against the stability that has been achieved through the good will of the countries participating in the Paris Agreement on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

This action, which has no legal basis for any decision, is nothing other than the beginning of overt political confrontation with the president of the Soviet Union and an undermining of his efforts to create a renewed union of sovereign states and build a common European home.

The latest attempt on the part of the leaders of the "Baltic Council" to play out another political spectacle in the name of the peoples of the Baltic area can no longer deceive anyone. This is confirmed by the position taken by official circles in the West and the world community toward the so-called Baltic question and active support of Gorbachev's policy.

At the same time we are even more convinced that the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are making their choice in favor of a voluntary, equal, new Union treaty. It is in this that people see the only possibility of avoiding economic chaos and the escalation of tension. Only with active participation in its formation will we be able to create conditions for civil peace in the Baltic area and prevent the tears of women and children.

We call for the supreme soviets of the Baltic republics to declare a moratorium on the adoption of decisions and actions that will lead to a collapse of the country and dispersion of the peoples.

[Passage indistinct; illegible signatures of approximately 25 deputies]

Baltic Information Bureau Opens in Denmark

LD2112081190 Moscow TASS in English 0737 GMT 21 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Sidorov]

[Text] Copenhagen December 21 TASS—An information bureau of the Soviet Baltic republics opened here on Thursday.

The opening ceremony was attended by the foreign ministers of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Iceland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

At the ensuing meeting, the foreign ministers discussed further expansion of Scandinavian countries' contacts with the Baltic republics in the economy, environmental protection and cultural cooperation.

Participants believe that the first meeting at such a level is a major step towards establishing closer mutually beneficial contacts and cooperation between the sides.

Within the framework of a programme for aid to Central and East European countries, Nordic countries are prepared to render support to economic reforms in the Baltic republics.

The ministers also expressed satisfaction with the opportunities that are opening up for information exchanges between Scandinavian and Baltic regions in light of the inauguration of the information bureau in Denmark. Such bureaus are expected to open subsequently in other Nordic countries as well.

The foreign ministers of the five Nordic countries expressed hope that talks on granting independence to the Baltic republics will begin between the Soviet Government, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia soon.

Four More Explosions Reported in Riga

Damage Several Buildings

LD2712161190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1521 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 27 Dec TASS—Explosions again resounded in Riga last night. There was damage to the railway hospital building, a hostel, and a kindergarten and school located at different ends of the town. There were no casualties. Panes of more than 200 windows were smashed, and doors and walls were damaged. Severe damage was caused to the Marshal Biryuzov Military College hostel, which accommodates the families of officers and NCO's. A charge exploded in the porch of the building. Stress was suffered by the hospital patients, especially those in the maternity ward.

There have been a total of 12 explosions in Riga in December, including four last night. Commenting on this criminal series, V. Bugay, chief of the town's administration of internal affairs, noted that the explosions are becoming increasingly powerful. He assesses them as deliberate acts of sabotage, aimed at weakening the Soviet state, destroying its property, and destabilizing the situation.

An investigation is in progress, and several possibilities are being studied. The Latvian Ministry of Internal Affairs has promised a "Zhiguli" car to whoever can lead it to the criminals, and the Executive Committee of Riga's Central District is willing to pay 3,000 rubles for similar information.

Minister Discusses Investigation

LD2712224590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Report by correspondent N. Kasyanova in Latvia; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] This information from Latvia will lead you to other thoughts. I remind you that the first explosion occured in Riga during the night of 12 December, then there were another five. Today another report of explosions has arrived from Latvia:

[Begin recording] [Kasyanova] This time the criminals chose the buildings of a kindergarten, a hospital, Russian Secondary School No 72, and an officers hostel of the Marshal Biryuzov Higher Military Academy. Fortunately there were no casualties.

[A. Vaznis, Latvian minister of internal affairs] We discussed this issue today, and we consider that the actions of these criminals go beyond the limits of the crime of hooliganism, and evidently today we are reclassifying them as acts of sabotage. We have an article in the criminal code, and all these actions, in my opinion come under this article.

[Kasyanova] An investigation is going on. Are there any, can you say anything more definite?

[Vaznis] Yes, of course an investigation is going on. Criminal proceedings have been instigated in all cases. There is a group headed by the deputy head of the ministry's investigative department, and in this group there is a sufficient number of specialists, investigators, operational workers, specialists, experts, and we are carrying out the work, of course. There are many interesting signals, there is certain information, but at the moment it is still too early to talk about it now, because first of al it must be fundamentally verified. We are sure that, nevertheless, in the very near future we will be able to discover this criminal group. [end recording]

Latvia's Rubiks on Need for Union Treaty

91UN0540A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 20 Dec 90 p 2

[Report by TASS correspondents A. Antsiferov, V. Zaytsev, and Yu. Sizov: "A Union Treaty Is Needed"]

[Text] *Alfreds Rubiks, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, numbering 120,000 communists, and USSR people's deputy, expressed confidence in the need to sign a Union treaty.*

"I represent that group of USSR people's deputies which has arrived at the congress with the firm intention of defending the need to conclude a new Union treaty," he said. The leader of the Latvian Communist Party sees this as the mandate of the electorate.

At present, continued A. Rubiks, public opinion is divided: Some are in favor of signing the treaty, and others are dead set against it. I am convinced, stressed Rubiks, that the country's legislature will express itself in favor of the Union treaty. The majority of the republic will be ready for it. Those who for any reason refuse to conclude the treaty will make their lives more difficult, and that will undoubtedly give rise to a wave of discontent from the population.

Continuing to talk about the political and economic situation in Latvia, A. Rubiks declared that it would be absurd for the republic not to participate in the Union treaty. After all, Latvia provides itself with only about five percent of all types of fuel and only half of its electrical energy. A. Rubiks considered ideas for an independent departure by the republic into the foreign market to be untenable. There is nothing to trade, he said, insofar as the volume of exported goods at present does not exceed several percent of the general volume of production in Latvia. "I will not even dwell on the fact that across the years such a deep integration of the economies has occurred and the division of labor has been introduced on such a wide scale among the Union republics that it is impossible to survive alone," stressed the USSR people's deputy.

Therefore, those who oppose the Union treaty are guided not by common sense but by narrow political ambitions. Just such a position is held by the leadership of Latvia, according to A. Rubiks, and it has led to the extreme aggravation of the political situation in the republic. The goal of this course, he added, is to repudiate the Union and establish a totalitarian nationalist regime in Latvia. Unfortunately, there is no doubt of this: The Supreme Soviet of the republic, in the person of the Latvian People's Front which makes up the majority in the legislature, is guided by the slogan, "The rights of the nation are higher than the rights of the individual."

A. Rubiks went on to say that previously this idea was covered up by discussions about democracy and perestroyka; now their goals are no longer hidden: They are trying to convince us that all problems will be resolved when certain "occupiers," practically everyone who does not have roots here dating from 1940, are driven from Latvia.

This aggravation of the political situation in Latvia, stressed A. Rubiks, is taking place against the background of a sharp deterioration in economic conditions. The volume of agricultural production has declined significantly. Industrial enterprises are suffering from the general epidemic—the violation of contractual obligations for mutual deliveries of production. The result is empty store shelves, ration cards, and popular dissatisfaction.

Until recently some residents of Latvia have been prepared to blame the leadership of the country for all misfortunes. The center, they said, has abandoned us and the president will not help us. It seemed that there were grounds for such a conclusion: The Union Constitution was flouted in Latvia and the edicts of the president were ignored. In this difficult situation the position of the Latvian Communist Party consists of not simply criticizing the center but of helping the president carry out measures to introduce constitutional and economic order. It should be noted, said A. Rubiks in conclusion, that the course declared by the president has been greeted in the republic with understanding and approval.

Landsbergis Calls Western Attention to Baltics

AU2512142990 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 24 Dec 90 p 5

[Interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Michael Stoessinger in Vilnius; date not given: "Gorbachev Is Only a Facade"]

[Text] [Stoessinger] Mr. President, USSR Interior Minister Bakatin was replaced; now Foreign minister Shevardnadze resigned. Does Moscow's course change, and what does this mean for the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, which are pushing toward independence?

[Landsbergis] The fact that the Moscow government is moving toward the right automatically increased the danger for us. This danger not only threatens the Baltic states but all peoples of the Soviet Union and, in the end, also the world.

[Stoessinger] Can you be more specific?

[Landsbergis] If power in the Moscow government is taken over by the rightist forces, this means a threat to our existence. What is the background of Shevardnadze's resignation? —the fact that the Moscow government has made concessions to the Western countries. I need not specifically mention the development in Germany. From this we can see that the rightist forces in the USSR still see the Western countries as enemies. Shevardnadze was their ally. This is the way of thinking. They were categorized as enemies by these forces and not as partners in a common, peaceful world. Here in the Baltic states we are categorized by the rightists as bourgeois elements, because we have demanded the old property of the people. These accusations are old, Stalinist ideologies and dogmas. Marxism is being revitalized.

[Stoessinger] First Bakatin, then Shevardnadze: Will President Mikhail Gorbachev be the next one?

[Landsbergis] I do not see any big difference in whether Gorbachev resigns or whether he is a toy in the hands of the rightist forces. Let us say he is a facade behind which the rightists are hiding. The rightists are using Gorbachev and his image because they know that they depend on the West to a certain extent. I think that the danger of Gorbachev being a facade is greater than the danger of his resignation. A resignation would be honorable and spectacular. This, however, is not wanted by the rightists for obvious reasons.

[Stoessinger] Are you speaking of the danger that Gorbachev might become a facade or is he already one?

[Landsbergis] Both are partly true. If the Western countries were finally to recognize what Gorbachev is, this would be good. But they want to keep Gorbachev under any circumstances.

[Stoessinger] Then this also applies to U.S. President Bush, whom you visited two weeks ago. What was the result of your visit?

[Landsbergis] My visit with President Bush was indeed a signal of the arising danger. It is impossible that one does not see this signal. Or perhaps one wants to ignore it deliberately. Yes, perhaps this is done with complete deliberation. I simply do not believe that the Western governments do not know what our situation is like.

[Stoessinger] Thus, you see the specific danger of a military intervention?

[Landsbergis] This is already the case. It is insidious. Of course, the rightist forces will avoid a sudden occupation.

[Stoessinger] What do you mean by: insidious?

[Landsbergis] They have already started to deploy armed patrols in our cities. In Klaipeda (Memel) there has been a law since Friday [21 December] according to which the patrols can arrest anyone whom they—for whatever reason—consider suspect. Of course, they do all this only in order to raise the tension and nervousness in the barracks. Apartments for soldiers, who come from East Germany, are already being requisitioned. Thus, one can already speak of an occupation.

[Stoessinger] Which reaction remains there for the Baltic states?

[Landsbergis] First of all, we are concentrating on the passive resistance by the inhabitants. There is civil disobedience; however, we no longer rule out armed action. Of course, this can be only of symbolic significance in view of the ratio of power. Should the Moscow government place our country under martial law, this will trigger a chain reaction. This will lead to an explosion in all republics. The Western countries must reconsider their position in view of the conditions here. They have to do so now because as soon as the chain reactions starts it will be too late.

Aggression here is an aggression toward the entire world. There must be an end to the Western worlds considering the things happening here as a domestic matter of the Soviet Union.

[Stoessinger] The world has looked toward Germany, now it is looking toward the Gulf. Has the cause of the Baltic states and of the entire Soviet situation been pushed to the fringes because of current events?

[Landsbergis] I call on the world to look at everything. If the world thinks that one may sacrifice one thing to the other, it becomes guilty.

Landsbergis Addresses Vilnius Sajudis Meeting

LD2712232890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] A Sajudis conference took place today at the building of the Supreme Council in Vilnius. It analyzed the political situation in Lithuania and examined a model of economic reform. The conference was opened by Chairman of the Board of the Sajudis Seimas Juozas Tumelis. Reports analyzing the political and economic situation were delivered and the Sajudis tasks were examined. The conference was addressed by Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania Vytautas Landsbergis. He made an extensive review of the international situation and the situation in Lithuania.

Prunskiene Urges Economic Ties With Australia

LD2412065990 Moscow TASS in English 0646 GMT 24 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Kuznetsov]

[Text] Canberra December 24 TASS—Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene called on Australia today to establish diplomatic relations with Lithuania.

According to a report by the ABC [Australian Broadcasting Corporation] radio corporation, she said on her arrival in Sydney that Lithuania would not sign a new union treaty under any circumstances because this would be tantamount to joining the Soviet Union.

Prunskiene who arrived in Australia at the invitation of the local Lithuanian community, will open the community's culture festival.

During her week-long visit to Australia, she will meet the country's prime minister and other officials and will hold talks to establish direct economic relations between Lithuania and Australia.

Incident at Nuclear Plant Termed 'Insignificant'

LD2712232190 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] According to an official report an incident, insignificant from the safety viewpoint, occurred at the Ignalina nuclear power plant this morning.

Approximately at half past 10 a.m. the first turbogenerator of the power plant was stopped due to an error of the automatic control system. The capacity of the whole first block automatically dropped from 1,250 to 750 megawatts. Power supply to consumers was not restricted. The equipment has not suffered and the safe exploitation conditions were not violated. The first block will retain its nominal capacity tomorrow morning.

Lithuanian Procurator on Customs Post Incident

LD2312043890 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 21 Dec 90

[Excerpts] Recently, various isolated conflicts involving military personnel have increased again. These involve activists of the CPSU organization in Lithuania.

Last Monday [17 December] an attack was carried out against a border post. Officials of the department for the country's protection who were manning the post were assaulted.

We asked Lithuanian Procurator General Arturas Paulauskas to comment on these events. Darius Tarasevicius interviewed him:

[Begin recording] [passage omitted] [Paulauskas] Yesterday morning I was informed by the Klaipeda city procurator that he had received an announcement for the chief of Klaipeda garrison informing the council chairman, and city mayor, and the chief of the Ministry of Internal Affairs section, and the procurator and chief of the section of the department for the country's protection about the patrols. Attention should be drawn to the fact that the announcement arrived on 20 December. It tells us that the events took place a day earlier according to a decree by the USSR president and a decree by the defense minister and a decree by the commander of the Baltic Fleet on patrols of armed soldiers being introduced in Klaipeda.

The last paragraph is especially disturbing. It notes that in the event of resistance against halting or disagreement demonstrated in any other fashion, decisive measures will be taken. This even extends to the use of arms. In addition, the military departments are already extending their functions both with regard to the military and to [word indistinct] citizens. One might say this announcement is tantamount to introduction of the commandant's regime within the city.

[Tarasevicius] Is there any basis for the leaders of the city's military garrison to introduce a commandant's hour, on their own authority, for no reason whatsoever?

[Paulauskas] First of all, we regard the Soviet Army in Klaipeda, or any other Lithuanian city, as the army of a foreign state. From the announcement, however, we see that it is based on some type of presidential order, defense minister's order, and Baltic Fleet commander's order. The president would hardly have signed this order in the presence of all these lower ranked individuals. It would be enough for just the president to sign it. He is simultaneously the commander-in-chief of the entire Army. There is no indication as to when he signed it. I doubt whether such a paper has been issued, because, even if one were to base onesself on the USSR laws concerning some extraordinary situation of presidential rule, there would need to be a legal document indicating when and under what circumstances this could be done and what sort of regime it must be. Not one of these indications can be found. This type of a directive, even under USSR law, is illegal. It is also explained in this announcement that violations and assaults against military personnel recently have increased. I wish to state that, on the contrary, during recent weeks no actions with regard to the military have been registered in Klaipeda. [passage omitted

I can tell you that this morning a telegram was received from Siauliai, from the secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party CPSU platform, Andreyev, in which it is stated that on 18 December Siauliai country's protection department workers arrived at the [name indistinct] soviet farm. There they apprehended a storekeeper, Kucinskiene, who also happens to be the secretary of the CPSU primary party organization. Taking her to their headquarters, they threatened her for her signature collection activity, for the Union treaty signing, insulted her and demanded she provide a written explanation as to why she was collecting signatures for the signing of the Union treaty and is disseminating the newspaper TARYBU LIETUVA. They forced her to renounce her communist beliefs. I think we will investigate this incident. If it comes to light that either one side or the other has violated some laws, appropriate measures will be taken.

[Tarasevicius] As I mentioned previously, the Eisiskes border post in Salcininkai Rayon was attacked last Monday. Lithuanian department for the country's protection officials who were performing their duties there were beaten.

Although it is known that this was the work of the Salcininkai Rayon Internal Affairs Ministry workers, the incident itself is engulfed in mystery. It is thought that the source of this incident goes back to a decision adopted several days ago by the so-called Salcininkai United Session to put an end to the activity in the rayon of the country's protection department. Procurator Arturas Paulauskas....

[Paulauskas] Perhaps now it is too early to come out with an immediate pronouncement as to who is guilty and who is justified. It is possible to describe somewhat the event itself. The incident started between two militias-Salcininkai militia workers and the country's protection workers—who were carrying out customs functions and border protection. The ongoing incident continued until inspection personnel arrive from the Salcininkai Internal Affairs Ministry. A fight ensured, during which the country's protection workers sustained injuries and were brought before the Internal Affairs Ministry in Salcininkai. Explanations were heard in the offices. Obviously this is no ordinary event. It has demonstrated a certain deep conflict which continues through the Salcininkai Internal Affairs Ministry. The country's protection [words indistinct] the earlier conducted session had terminated the activity of the country's protection workers in this rayon. This forces us to think that the ministry workers had begun to carry out that decision; however, it is too early to arrive at a conclusion.

[Tarasevicius] Lithuanian Procurator General Arturas Paulauskas has commented on isolated instances of conflict that took place this week. [end recording]

Lithuania Passes Law on Direct Rule

LD2712235790 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] Lithuania's Supreme Council today passed a law on direct rule of administrative territorial units. The law stipulates that direct administrative rule may be introduced for up to one year and by special decision even longer on the territories of respective municipalities by a decision of the Supreme Council. This will be possible in cases envisaged in the law in the fundamental self-rule and in cases when no local municipal council is elected on a certain territory. Direct administrative rule is introduced where the local municipal council is dissolved, where the top municipal officials either appointed by the local council or elected to their posts are dismissed, and when the parts of the law on local self-rule are suspended in a given territory. The law stipulates that if administrative rule is introduced on a certain territory, the government immediately appoints its authorized representative to perform the functions of administrative rule. This rule comes to an end as soon as a new municipal council is elected and assumes its functions.

The members of the Polish faction in parliament opposed the law during the debate and staged the walkout during the voting procedure.

Estonian-Russian Political Conflict Viewed

91UN0491B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 14 Dec 90 pp 2-3

[Article by special correspondent S. Tarakanov: "Estonian Confrontation"]

[Text] Tallinn—*Nasta Pino, whose speech was quoted in the preceding letter, very accurately expressed the idea of the cramped conditions on the captain's bridge of the republic's political life. It is now reminiscent, in my opinion, of a ship, overburdened with problems, lying below the water line. Relations among the crew are a thorough knot of contradictions at all levels from the hold through the deck superstructure, with the ship's relations with its port of registration on the point of being severed.*

Let us examine this knot of contradictions from the point of view of the "port of registration"—relations with the Soviet Union. According to the 30 March declaration on Estonia's official status, its occupation by the Soviet Union on 17 June 1940 did not terminate the existence of the Republic of Estonia de jure. The state power of the USSR on the territory of Estonia was deemed illegal as of the moment it was established. "A possible interpretation of our official status," Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet, observed in his report in Helsinki on 24 August, "is as follows: On 30 March Estonia quit the political system of the Soviet Union. In the transitional period this decision will be infused with content. There will be increasingly few Union laws employed on our territory, and Estonia will begin to create its own independent state mechanism." This position has been confirmed repeatedly by the leadership of the republic and national radicals. A resolve to adhere to it to the end was also demonstrated at a recent joint session of the parliaments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia buttressed by a categorical refusal to sign a future Union treaty.

There is in the Estonian Supreme Soviet an opposition in the shape of deputies who have joined four factions and who represent the interests of the Russian-speaking electorate, in the main. But its opinion is usually not heeded in parliament, alas. At a recent session Russian-speaking deputies proposed a draft decree in which they suggested that a moratorium be declared on the adoption of political decisions intensifying the crisis of confidence between the directive bodies of the USSR and Estonia and exacerbating the situation in the republic. They voiced a proposal concerning the formation of a group of observers of the republic Supreme Soviet to study the processes of elaborating and concluding the Union treaty. These proposals were rejected by majority vote.

The problem of Estonia's legal status sits, it may be said, on the delayed-action bomb which is the referendum issue. Member of legislature Genik Israyelyan put it thus: If the need for a referendum is denied, how will it be known what the people, on whose behalf all problems are allegedly being resolved, actually think? He obtained an answer from Arnold Ruutel, who believes that a referendum is now unauthorized inasmuch as one was not conducted in 1940 either, when the republic was made part of the USSR. In addition, the population in Estonia speaking a different language was quite small before the war. Of course, A. Ruutel said, we adhere to the viewpoint that violence cannot be answered with violence. This means that the Russian-speaking population must have rights. A national right needs to be clearly specified at the time of determination of the fate of the republic, however.

What in fact is meant by this national right? The answer, dear reader, we will find in the above-mentioned speech of the head of the Estonian state in Helsinki, in which he interprets his understanding of the problem of citizenship. "A serious range of issues," he said, "is connected with citizenship, particularly in respect of citizens of the USSR living in Estonia. There is every reason to believe that their number, initially at least, will be considerable. Arrangements with the Union are therefore necessary on various social questions, the political rights of the USSR citizens who are permanently resident here, and so forth. Their participation in elections to local organs of authority under certain conditions remains a matter of dispute, but it is absolutely ruled out in the elections of the supreme state organs."

The prospects for those from other republics could not be painted more clearly. The possibility of finding themselves without rights and cut off by a state border from their kinfolk does not attract everyone and is implanting uncertainty in the hearts of many. Their hopes of assistance from the center are melting like snow in a hot hand. Certain politicians and members of legislature feel uncertain because of Moscow's position. This was clearly evidenced by the meeting on 5 December of representatives of political parties on the issue of the Union treaty. On the one hand the prevailing opinion is that it is not edicts demanding the reversal of one fact or another from local lawmakers which people expect of the center but specific measures to preserve the Union. On the other, the tankophobia syndrome, about which Enn Poldroos, leader of the liberal democrats and member of the republic parliament, has conjectured. He believes that a great deal will depend on who instills in the president the greater fear—Bush or our generals. If the latter, it will be a bad business. Whether the treaty is signed or not, the tanks will flatten Estonian soil all the same.

The hopes of politicians of the national idea of concluding with the USSR merely an economic agreement and of coming to no political agreements are becoming increasingly illusory. Therefore, like a family's first child, they are nursing the hope of concluding a treaty with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. How it is being protected may be judged if only by the fact that neither in August nor in November was the question of full representation decided at plenary meetings of the Supreme Soviet when it was proposed to include Russian-speaking delegates in the delegation which would negotiate with Russia. In addition, when Deputy V. Lebedev set forth at a session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on 3 October, on behalf of a group of members of the Estonian legislature, their position concerning measures pertaining to the defense of Estonia's economic independence, the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a statement condemning the actions of this group. It said, among other things, that V. Lebedev's speech contained an appeal to prevent the conclusion of direct agreements between the RSFSR and the Republic of Estonia and was an attempt to conduct unauthorized unilateral negotiations at the interstate level.

The day following publication of this statement V. Lebedev spoke at a regular meeting of the Estonian Supreme Soviet session on behalf of the four groups of deputies. He rejected the presidium's accusation and emphasized that the purpose of the statement was to divert the Estonian people's attention from the extremely serious situation brought about by the price rises and the establishment of an economic border and to channel their discontent against the deputies, public organizations, and the strata of the population which disagree with the actions of the republic government and the Supreme Soviet. "The candid words," he said, "spoken from the podium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet met with the deputies' understanding. We are sure that, when discussing the treaty with Estonia, they will know to include in it provisions to safeguard the interests and rights of the nonindigenous population. It makes no sense to claim that we are opposed to such a treaty and opposed to friendship with Russia and the other republics. We assure you that we support agreements, inasmuch as they alone can ensure normal living conditions, in accordance with international norms, for the hundreds of thousands of non-Estonians."

It should be observed that activists of the "Russian Party" have appreciably stepped up their activity of late in the establishment of horizontal relations with other republics and territories adjoining the economic border. Thus a delegation was formed following a decision of a joint session of the city soviets of three cities of Northeast Estonia—Kohtla-Jarve, Narva and Sillamyae—and three cities of Leningrad Oblast—Ivangorod, Kingisepp and Slantsy—to meet with the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of Estonia and Russia in order to notify the leaders of the two republics of the position of the six cities of the region in respect of the impending conclusion of a treaty between them.

On 23 November a meeting was held with B. Yeltsin, and four days later, at a meeting of the Narva City Soviet, members of the delegation briefed the deputies on their talks with Boris Nikolayevich. Russia's leader supported the opinion of the deputies of the region that the Estonian delegation must necessarily include representatives of the Russian-speaking population; if there is no such representation, there will be no signing of a treaty either. He assured the delegation that a supplementary agreement would be signed between Russia and Estonia especially on matters of citizenship. When the question of actual support for the policy of the leaders of the Russian-speaking population in their confrontation with the republic leadership, specifically, the policy of the three cities of Northeast Estonia, cropped up, Boris Nikolayevich emphatically rejected any possibility of Russia interfering in the internal affairs of the sovereign Republic of Estonia.

"Immediately following the talks," a Narva emissary to Moscow said, "our delegation expressed the opinion that Yeltsin had abandoned us to the whim of fate and had betrayed us."

It is believed that the collapsed hopes for real assistance from Russia accelerated the action of the mechanism whose mainspring was the "God helps those who help themselves" principle. A third session of the Interregional Council of People's Deputies and Working People's Delegates of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] took place on 7 December in Narva. The decision to consider Estonia's subscribing to the signing of a Union treaty essential and, if necessary, to seek the right of signature of this treaty by the Interregional Council, "as a representative body of democracy of the Estonian SSR," was adopted. To propose that the local soviets which are a part of the Interregional Council and

the labor collectives supporting unity with the USSR organize discussion of the draft treaty locally. To ask USSR people's deputies from Estonia to speak at the congress.

The session formulated measures pertaining to the social protection of the working people under the conditions of market relations, supported the edict of the USSR president concerning an intensification of worker control, and adopted an appeal to the coordinating council of the "Soyuz" group requesting that the Interregional Council be admitted to this association as a collective member.

In the course of discussing the action program of the Interregional Council the following decision was adopted also: "Under the conditions of legalizing extra-state militarized formations in Estonia which threaten the safety of the population, to create under the auspices of the Interregional Council a system of civil rights authorities ensuring compliance with the USSR Constitution on the territory of the Estonian SSR (an internal affairs administration, procuracy, arbitration tribunal)".

As we can see, matters have taken a serious turn, and for every action there is now an equal and opposite reaction. To what is this second Newtonian law, transferred from physics to the sphere of politics, leading? To a repetition of the Moldovan version? If so, should there not be a more flexible "eastern" and domestic policy on the part of the republic leadership and members of legislature? Undoubtedly, however, practice shows that each attempt to make a political curve into a straight line is viewed in Estonia as a struggle of personalities for power. The rectilinear government of Edgar Savisaar is being subjected to concentrated criticism. The Congress of Estonia has borne down on it with all its might. At the third session at the end of October many speakers proposed a vote of no confidence in the government. The report of Tunne Kelam, chairman of the board of the Estonia Committee, was portrayed as the emergence of a new dictatorship, and his speech at the grave of Konstantin Pyats, first president of the Republic of Estonia, was called the onset of the autumn of Estonian democracy.

The idea of creating a government of national unity, which subsequently enjoyed surprising development, was born at the congress. Truly sensational was the so-called letter of eight private individuals and then their declaration of the principles of the activity of a popular unity government, which should be appointed by the Supreme Soviet, and the Estonia Committee would recognize it as the government in the transitional period. This was an open challenge to the E. Savisaar cabinet, which is accused of being incapable of conducting a dialogue with Moscow, where, in fact, the keys to Estonia's independence are to be found, while the foreign policy which it is pursuing is a laughing-stock. But what was most incredible was the fact that there alongside one another, beneath the document, were the signatures of former Prime Minister Indrek Toome and Yaak Allik, member of the Independent Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee Bureau, leaders of the "Vaba Eesti" ("Free Estonia") association, and their political antipodes from the anticommunist Estonia Committee Tunne Kelam and Kaydo Kama.

E. Savisaar said at a government news conference that he did not consider it necessary to comment on private individuals meeting and writing some statement or other. Were they backed by eight important organizations.... But, as the premier observed, the base of the Communist Party of Estonia is shrinking constantly, the best days of the Congress of Estonia are already behind it, the "Vaba Eesti" association will soon become a golf club....

I. Toome declared in the newspaper EDAZI that his signature on the statement does not mean that he intends once again to lay claim to the role of prime minister. The activity of the present government, be believes, is characterized by two directions: Estonia's achievement of independence and struggle against possible pretenders to power. Unfortunately, I. Toome observed, the second direction is at times beginning to dominate, producing increasingly new enemies.

We have to agree with him in this sense. There was an attempt to besmirch the reputation of A. Ruutel, by attributing to him ties to the CIA. Foreign Minister Lennart Meri insistently advises his colleague "without portfolio," Endel Lipmaa, whose duties include "eastern policy," to acquire a compass lest he get the parts of the world confused. He is worried by E. Lipmaa's activity in the West. The struggle between the government, which prepared a concept of monetary reform with the aid of an adviser from Sweden, and the Bank of Estonia, which has its own view of the problem, is not abating, and so forth.

People are watching this enervating struggle, which has become an end in itself, tightening their belts, and gulping down the air of uncertainty of their existence. Is there a way out of the crises: economic, political, moral? There is, it would seem. If, of course, we proceed from the fact that there are no utterly hopeless situations. One path, in my opinion, is recognition by all of the reality that discussion with Moscow on an equal footing will be possible only when the relations between the Estonian and Russian communities are built on an equal footing. There is a legal basis for this also. This, for example, is what Doctor of Legal Sciences Reyn Myullerson, member of the UN Human Rights Committee, said in an interview with SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA:

"There are practically no mono-national states. What would a nation's right mean in this case? Just one thing—the representatives of other ethnic groups would be excluded from the realization of this right by way, say, of elections, referendums and so forth. The answer is unequivocal. This would be a clear violation of the political rights of the representatives of other ethnic groups."

Edifying some people with the words of the scholar is far from my intent. I am convinced that for the leaders, members of legislature and politicians of the republic these canons of international law are well known. But recognition of them would postpone realization of the national idea indefinitely. This is why a "sacred cow" is being made of it. But it is worth thinking, perhaps, about the results of the milk it produces for the health of the nation and all Estonian landsmen.

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Continues Meetings

Approves Budget Bill

LD2612203490 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 26 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondents Pavel Ostrov and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow December 26 TASS—The Russian parliament passed a bill on the republican budget for 1991 today.

The bill is based on Russia's declaration of sovereignty and Russian Laws, regulating the republic's transition to market relations.

It sets Russia's income at 152 billion roubles and expenses at more than 161 billion, allowing a budget deficit of nine billion roubles.

The republic will allocate 23.4 billion roubles into the union budget to enable the union to implement powers delegated to it by the Russian Federation.

The bill attaches much importance to financing the social revival of the Russian countryside in line with decisions taken by the emergency Congress of Russian People's Deputies held in Moscow on November 27 to December 15, Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev said.

Fifteen per cent of the republic's GNP, some 25 billion roubles, will be allocated for the purpose, Silayev said.

The passage of the bill is a very important stage in parliamentary work, Russian President Boris Yeltsin said today.

"Work with union bodies lies ahead," Yeltsin said.

"We have not done anything illegal. . We have passed our own budget and must fight for it," he said.

Declares Christmas Holiday

LD2712104390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0950 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondents Yuriy Kuzmin and Pavel Ostrov from the Russian House of Soviets]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec—Today the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet declared 7 January—the first day of Christmas according to the calendar of the Russian Orthodox Church—a non-working day. Such a decision was adopted as a sign of respect for the religious feelings of believers in response to the appeal of Aleksiy II, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia.

Ruslan Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet, noted that since there are also other religions in the Russian Federation, then in the event that corresponding appeals come in from other confessions too, they "will be considered respectfully in the same spirit." The session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet plans to complete its work today.

Finance Minister Resigns

LD2712123190 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] The finance minister of the Russian Federation, Boris Fedorov, 33, has submitted his resignation. As he explained the move in a press interview, he refused to strengthen by his presence in the Ivan Silayev cabinet the illusion that this government is moving toward a market. The minister pointed out that members of the Russian Government are afraid of assuming responsibility for unpopular decisions such as liberalizing prices. Instead, they constantly take populistic measures leading to further expenditure although the revenue continues to decline and this is a direct road to financial bankruptcy of the republic and the entire union, stressed Boris Fedorov.

Legislature Ends Session

LD2712204690 Moscow TASS in English 2011 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent Yuriy Kozmin and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—The last day of the Russian parliament second session was packed.

The standing Russian parliament decided to set up a committee on security within its structure. Although regulations about this body have not been approved yet, it will evidently be preoccupied with issues of Russia's sovereignty, military policy and the regulation of the operation of appropriate republican executive bodies.

The debate on the next question of today's agenda was brief. The legislature approved three legislative acts on amendments and supplements to relevant laws of the Russian Federation, since the Russian Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme legislature in the Russian Federation, adopted "The Decision on a Programme for the Revival of the Russian Countryside and the Development of the Agro-industrial Complex" and "The Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Russian Federation."

The session then heard a speech by Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev in connection with the resignation of Republican Finance Minister Boris Fedorov. Silayev negatively described Fedorov's activities and proposed Igor Lazarev, Russian first deputy finance minister, for this post.

However, this issue was postponed until the next session after a heated debate. Lazarev will work as acting finance minister for the time being.

In connection with issues, which emerged at the Fourth USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the all-Union legislature, during the discussion of the budget system of the Russian federation for 1991, the republican parliament approved a decision on measures for its implementation.

The decision instructs the presidium of the Russian parliament and republican government, proceeding from republican laws, "to participate in the formation of the USSR budget by agreeing the budget policy with the legislatures of union republics and the Soviet Union."

The second session of the Russian parliament adopted over 120 laws and decisions. The most important among them are a package of laws on agrarian reform, laws on property, referendums and other legislative acts aimed at implementing sweeping economic and political changes in the Russian Federation.

North Ossetia Adopts Sovereignty Declaration

LD2612230990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1443 GMT 26 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 26 Dec (TASS)—The North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] within the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the USSR—that is how the North Ossetia Autonomous SSR will henceforth be named. A decision on this was adopted at the second stage of the session of the Supreme Soviet of that republic which ended today. Taking amendments into consideration, the deputies adopted a declaration about the republic's state sovereignty and its constitution.

Land, natural wealth, its minerals, and other resources have been declared the property of its people. Relations with the USSR and the RSFSR, as well as with other republics, are determined by a Union treaty. The supremacy of the Constitution of the North Ossetian SSR and its laws is established on the territory of the republic. The Ossetian and Russian languages are the state languages of the republic.

The deputies also discussed questions concerning the drafts of Union and federal treaties, and the concept of the basic directions of stabilization of the national economy and the transition to a market economy, and of the economic, social, and cultural development of North Ossetia in 1991, and other problems.

RSFSR Deputies Congress Outcome Viewed

PM2712162190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Ye. Ivanov report: "Let Time Be the Judge—Results of the Russian Congress"]

[Text] The opening of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies, it seems, has eclipsed all other political events in the country. It is due to adopt truly fateful decisions, and in its significance this event will obviously be the major event of the year that is drawing to its close. Nevertheless, it is already clear that the polemic that was conducted in the Kremlin at the Congress of Russian People's Deputies for more than two weeks has already left its mark on the USSR congress' polemic.

A whole epoch stands between the First Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies and the one that has just been held. A mountain of problems quickly cooled the hottest heads. The main "hobbyhorse"—criticism of the center—has been transformed into consciousness of the inevitability of cooperation with this center, without which, it proved on the closest inspection, Russia is threatened with catastrophe.

In the few months that it has been working the Russian legislature has well and truly "flexed its muscles." But the stronger it became, the more measured and cautious were its evaluations, and the more responsibly did it adopt decisions. It is shifting with increasing frequency from confrontation with the center to cooperation, understanding perfectly well that it is now simply impossible to get by without the "dyarchy" that it had been deriding.

Such was the road to the extraordinary congress. The congress surprised many with the abundance of principled decisions, more than fulfilling its scheduled program. All forms of land ownership were legalized, including private ownership, the corresponding amendments were made to the RSFSR Constitution, and an assessment was made of the Union treaty concept. It is worth bearing in mind that the success was achieved under circumstances of a fairly fierce dispute between different groups. If the Russian leadership preserved neutrality and tried to steer clear of participation in political squabbling—and outwardly, at any rate, this was indeed how things stood! —then, undoubtedly, we should recognize the primordial constructive nature of democratic procedures.

Let us recall the two tensest moments of the congress, one of which reached the point where the resignation of R. Khasbulatov and I. Silayev was demanded. The first time that this happened was when representatives of the "Communists of Russia" group were upset by the clause on private ownership of land and on the buying and

selling of land. The congress presidium, undoubtedly closer in its views to the "Democratic Russia" group, had to agree to the compromise proposed by Deputy S. Shakhray. It was written into the "agrarian" resolution that land plots earmarked for private ownership are liable for sale not sooner than in 10 years time.

The "Communists of Russia" faction of the legislature agreed to this, although earlier it had held a different opinion—that private ownership of land should not be allowed. If they were satisfied with such a minute concession, then the question perforce arises: Were they really so confident of being right earlier? This question is all the more legitimate in view of the fact that during the second "congress crisis" this faction, which was initially blocking Article 11 of the Constitution, allowing all types of land ownership, again was the one to make concessions.

Through all this the time factor, on which both wings of the legislature set their hopes, can be seen. People's Deputy D. Volkogonov, who represents the "Left Center" faction, said the following: "In a few years time we will find it uncomfortable to recall these underhand games for the sake of not allowing private ownership of land." Deputies from the "Communists of Russia" faction could also cite the same thesis, that time will judge all. One thing is clear: This congress group no longer relies on its comrades-in-arms in the legislature, which is moving to the left for all to see, under the influence of the atmosphere that has developed in the White House on Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment. Man is not static, as we know, especially in our rapidly moving times.

But I, for one, am frightened by the radicality of the "agrarian" resolution. Are we not dashing from one extreme to the other? Will kolkhozes not now be suppressed with the same zeal as that with which the peasants were once driven into them by force? Moreover, congress squabbles are often a long way from the real life of the machine operator and the milkmaid, brought up on the principle of "everything around is the kolkhoz', everything around is mine..."

If only we could all go to sleep for six months, and wake up already in the market and a private farming system [fermerstvo]! Alas, it does not happen like that. Both the one and the other must be created, built, and, on the way... things have to be broken down. Foundations which have taken root over decades, the desperate opposition of the bureaucratic-functionary apparatus, must be smashed; human psychology must be restructured. I still remember very well from my school textbooks the call: Give us 100,000 tractors, and we will change the patriarchal countryside into a socialist countryside. The tractors were given—not 100,000, but millions—and now they say: No, what we built in the countryside is not socialism. But just give us 100,000 private farmers, and then... The poor Russian peasant!

"More than anything else on earth, I fear extremes," USSR People's Deputy A. Yemelyanov, academician of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, told me at the congress. "More than anything I fear 'breaks' of any kind." The congress adopted a wise decision in making all types of ownership equal in rights. Russia's leadership will be assuming too great a responsibility before history if it pressures the peasant again. Especially in view of the fact there is very, very much here that is unclear. Who will provide the farmer with land, and how? How is the tax in kind to be squared with the clause in the Constitution that says that the peasant is the complete master of the fruits of his labor? Why is a land tax needed if the land in our country beings to the people regardless? Who will determine this tax, and how? I am afraid that the Russian legislature has either got bogged down in these questions, or else it is simply making a hash of things.

The more you speak to a large number of specialists, the more clearly you understand: The healthy skepticism of the "Communists of Russia," is needed like never before. Finding themselves in effect in opposition, they warned the congress against hasty decisions. Even if in the future they prove to be wrong a thousand times over, this should be put down to their credit, if today there exists the slightest doubt as to the well-foundedness of the adopted decision. Evidently, even the most furious radicals are beginning to understand this. For it is impossible to decide the destinies of thousands of people without taking all shades of opinion into account.

It is no accident that the Russian Supreme Soviet is moving closer and closer to centrist positions. This influenced the course of the congress, especially in the exchange of opinions on the draft Union Treaty. The congress expressed itself unequivocally in favor of its being concluded, and for the Union of SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republics]. R. Khasbulatov even stressed his bewilderment that the word "socialist" in the abbreviation "USSR" has been replaced in the draft by the word "sovereign." Not because that one word is more important than the other, but in the sense that the socialist idea is not so bad in itself, and it is not worth renouncing it. The congress nonetheless did not make up its mind to take the step of concluding the treaty right away. The reasons for this were given by B. Yeltsin: The process should not stem from the center, but from the republics; there are not the necessary refinements; and the future state structure of Russia itself is unclear.

In his speech at the Union congress, he reasserted his previous position. The reasons he adduced are apparently logical, and it is difficult to contest them. But all the same, a man occupying so high a post really ought to listen to his opponents. They spoke at the congress about this very point, that the country was already five-and-a-half years late concluding a Union treaty. Evidently B. Yeltsin is confident his policy will successfully become the magnetic force that will bring together the crumbling Union. Russia is no longer to be the "first among equals," and the leaders of the other republics can

pretend to the role of peacemakers with the same success. Attempts to make the center some sort of consultative organ like the European legislature are fraught with unpredictable consequences. First and foremost for the 65 million people who live outside their national-state entities.

Furthermore, geopolitical tendencies must also be considered. The Russian leadership, in seeking to conduct an autonomous international policy, simply has no right not to consider these tendencies. The other day none other than FRG Chancellor H. Kohl stated that the united Germany, like the whole of the world, is interested in the stability of the present borders of the USSR. It is possible to understand him. The commotion that, God forbid, will begin in our country with the alteration of interrepublican borders is capable of exploding the calm so long awaited in Europe. For this reason as well it is simply impermissible to dally over Union Treaty.

Lastly, something which also cannot be passed over when speaking of the results of this congress: It was exceedingly protracted. The democratism of the chair is fine up to a certain point. But when he calls for a rejection of confrontation without switching off the microphone through which speakers are giving their political opponents a drenching... Besides, the deputies are "fine ones" themselves: Some of them still need many lessons in political civility. Every speaker is invariably accompanied by the responses of a "chorus," as in Ancient Greek tragedies. Indeed, at times it was such that the walls of the Great Kremlin Palace shook.

The press has already managed to describe this congress as "historic": Our attraction to the definitions of the period of stagnation is great. Great decisions were undoubtedly adopted at it. But they are only a step toward the thing that citizens of Russia are aiming: a content and peaceful life. The end of the road is, I fear, still a long way off.

Irkutsk Oblast Party Delegates 'Dissatisfied'

PM2712104990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent V. Yermolayev: "Difficult Talk"]

[Text] Irkutsk, 23 Dec—The oblast report and election party conference, which lasted two days, has ended in Irkutsk. There were intense and difficult discussions. The obkom [oblast committee] plenum held in early December deemed the CPSU obkom draft report to be unsatisfactory and recommended that it be fundamentally reworked.

And now the conference... Its delegates also remained dissatisfied with the repeatedly reworked report on the main avenues of the oblast party organization's activity. Incidentally, recently 20,000 people have left the organization. Those who spoke in the debates expressed anxiety and concern at the serious defects in the work of the obkom bureau which has adopted a conciliatory, defensive stance in the struggle against negative phenomena.

The oblast party organization has essentially remained without its press organ. V. Chalikov, first secretary of the Bratsk City Committee, and other speakers stated that the newspaper VOSTOCHNO-SIBIRSKAYA PRAVDA has become an instrument for the destruction of the CPSU. This has happened with the direct connivance of bureau members and secretaries.

V.M. Spirin was elected obkom first secretary on an alternative basis.

Orel Oblast Holds Party Conference

PM2712101590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent N. Utkin: "Second Stage Completed"]

[Text] Orel, 23 Dec—The oblast party conference, whose first stage was held six months ago, completed its work yesterday. The delegates discussed the CPSU obkom report and the program for the oblast party organization's program, the report of the auditing commission, and also information on the budget and measures to improve the party committees' financial work.

N.A. Volodin was reelected first secretary of the CPSU obkom at an organizational plenum.

Bashkiriya Supreme Soviet Debates 91 Budget

LD2812020190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Report by correspondent M. Gafurov in Ufa on the Bashkiriya Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet proceedings, including recorded interview with M.E. Bugera, chairman of the Bashkiriya Supreme Soviet Commission on Social and Economic Devlopment; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Gafurov] Among the issues put forward at the present session—and there are 16—there is no doubt that the main attention of the people's deputies was given to the state plan for the economic and social development of Bashkiriya, and its state budget for 1991.

Expenditure on social measures, education, health care, art, culture, and sports will grow by more than half in comparison with this year. For the first time, the part of the budget dealing with expenditure provides for the allocation of money for funds for regional development and ecological measures, which is very important for Bashkiriya, where a critical ecological situation has arisen. At the same time the session noted that the budget has been calculated, as before, as a sum of the indices of enterprises, and not according to the needs of a Republic that has announced its state sovereignty.

[Begin recording] [Gafurov] In the opinion of certain deputies the budget does not take into account the switch to the market economy, and neither does it provide for the protection of the least well-off sections of the population, with increases in prices and possible unemployment.

[Bugera] Certainly. The first variant of the draft budget proposed by the Ministry of Finances did not take into account the necessity of the social protection of the population. After discussion in the Supreme Soviet's standing commissions, however, an article appeared on expenditure to the tune of 35 million rubles, to be used mainly to support the unemployed and somehow reduce negative social consequences.

[Gafurov] Do you think that this budget will get us out of trouble?

[Bugera] If we are able to direct our efforts firmly, so that our budget receives those deductions that are unjustly—not competently, in our opinion—sent to the center budget, the budget of the Union of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, then it will get us out of trouble. Of course, we cannot solve all problems inside the Republic; we cannot break out of the common economic area of the Union, Russia—but we can do something on our level. Now, as a matter of fact, we are trying to get the Council of Ministers to present the package of measures that has already been developed and established by creative groups.

Kuybyshev Deputies Restore Name to Samara

PM2712162790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 90 Union Edition p 6

[Sergey Zhigalov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Samara Makes a Comeback"]

[Text] Kuybyshev—Deputies of the Kuybushev Oblast Soviet have voted to restore the historic name of Samara to the city and oblast.

A weighty argument in favor of restoring historical justice was provided among other things by the letter-cum-appeal from USSR People's Deputy Academician D. Likhachev, chairman of the Soviet Culture Fund Board, in which he noted among other things that around 40 cities, villages, and settlements in the country bear the name of V. Kuybyshev. Even Kuybyshev's "next door neighbor" is called Novokuybyshevsk. The name Samara, however, is a monument to the history of all the peoples of the Volga region.

Chelyabinsk To Hold Nuclear Power Referendum

PM2712105390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent V. Cherepanov: "Referendum Scheduled"]

[Text] Passions have been kindled around the construction of an AES [nuclear electric power station] in the South Urals after the Chelyabinsk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies made the decision on the matter.

Although this very difficult choice was recognized as having no alternative, a whole series of demands have been made on union and republican organs without whose unfailing support the station's construction should not be resumed. Nonetheless accusations of "colluding with the departments" and "betraying voters' interests" have again been leveled against the soviet leadership and the deputies.

The recent session of the Chelyabinsk City Soviet of People's Deputies announced that a referendum will be held 3 March 1991 during which the city's inhabitants should voice their attitude not only toward the construction of the AES but also toward the burying of radioactive waste which comes to the oblast from other regions of the country.

Kaliningrad To Open to Foreigners From 1 Jan

LD2712133190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Text] A decision by the Russian Government has become a sort of key to the city. By decree of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, foreigners will be allowed to visit Kaliningrad and a number of rayons in the oblast—which has had the status of a closed region for more than 40 years—from 1 January next year. The Ministry of Defense and the USSR KGB have agreed with this decision.

Russian Farmers To Train in Panama

LD2512133990 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 25 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Chernov]

[Text] Panama City December 25 TASS—Panama is ready to help the Russian Federation revive its countryside under the "Russian Farmer" programme, Panamanian Agricultural Development Minister Ezequiel Perez Rodriguez told TASS here on Monday [24 Dec].

Under the understandings reached, a group of Russian farmers will undergo training in Panamanian agricultural regions in the near future to gain knacks in organising and conduting farming and will familiarise themselves with the fundamentals of commercial and banking activities in this sphere.

Despite the absence of diplomatic relations between the two countries, the programme has excellent prospects, and its implementation will be of mutual benefit, the minister stressed.

"We believe that the development of economic contacts helps boost multilateral relations between the two nations," he added.

The "Russian Farmer" programme was set up at the initiative of various state and public organisations, including the NOVOSTI news agency, the Russian Commercial Bank, the "Blue Movement" mass organisation (for man's social ecology through creative activities of the masses), the Nechernozemie production amalgamation and the ROSSIYA MOLODYOZHNAYA magazine.

Farmers from Britain, the United States, New Zealand and Canada expressed readiness to support the programme. Australia and the Netherlands also expressed interest in this project.

Leningrad Experts Advise Against Finland Dam

LD2412100790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 24 Dec 90

[Excerpts] The results of the work of the international commission of ecologists which studied the advisability of constructing the huge dam between the north and the south shores of the Gulf of Finland to protect [Leningrad] city from flooding have been made public. The conclusions, which take the form of recommendations, have been presented by scientists from Western Europe and the United States. [passage omitted]

Members of the ecology commission of the Leningrad soviet, while acknowledging the professionalism of the authoritative experts, nevertheless did not agree with the assessments of the foreign specialists. They have adopted a decision advising against the construction of the dam.

Western Republics

Belorussian KGB Head Refutes Sabotage Claim

LD2712222590 Moscow TASS in English 2107 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Bogdanov and Aleksandr Kryzhanovskiy]

[Text] Minsk December 27 TASS—"There is no economic sabotage in Belorussia," said Chairman of the Belorussian Security Committee Eduard Shirkovskiy, replying to an interpellation by republican legislators.

This appraisal differs from the description of the situation in the country given by Chairman of the All-Union Security Committee Vladimir Kryuchov at the fourth USSR Congress of People's Deputies. What has prompted such an optimistic conclusion?

Speaking to lawmakers, Chirkovskiy said that republican KGB officers, together with republican militia, carried out an inspection of commodities and materials in the republic after the all-Union parliament adopted a relevant decision and the Soviet president issued a decree on combatting economic sabotage.

They inspected many warehouses but did not uncover any substantial quantities of concealed consumer goods. Of course, they detected insignificant misappropriations, cases of profiteering and abuse of one's office.

Legal proceedings were instituted in many cases. However, according to Shirkovskiy, the analysis of these facts does not reveal premeditated operations aimed at destroying the economy and undermining perestroika.

He emphasised that the main reason for the economic crisis is not sabotage but the disruption of customary horizontal and vertical economic relations.

Moldovan Deputies Support Presidential Decree

LD2712150190 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 27 Dec 90

[BY MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev December 27 TASS—"The presidential decree on the stabilisation of the situation in Moldova should be ratified and implemented." This is the main idea expressed in several interviews given by USSR people's deputies from Moldova to Soviet Radio and Television.

"The decree cost us much work and effort, and we should not reject it without trying to comprehend it. It differs a great deal from what we suggested. One should bear in mind, however, that the decree does not infringe upon our interests on the most important issue: It is aimed at preserving the territorial integrity of Moldova," said USSR People's Deputy Georgiy Gidirim, Moldavian minister of public health.

He was supported by the well-known Moldavian composer Yevgeniy Doga. "The decree is actually the first concrete step taken by the central authorities, which is aimed at preserving the territorial integrity of the republic.

"We should reciprocate by similar actions and not disregard this move. If supporters of the new republics do not take the decree into account, then it will be clear to everybody who wants what," he said.

"I want very much that our beautiful Moldova should remain as it is, that its territory is not reshaped. The decree on stabilisation in Moldova is a real chance for it, and it should not be missed," said Aleksandr Mokanu, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Statement Criticizes Grand National Assembly

LD2112033690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1337 GMT 20 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 20 Dec (TASS)—The republican party press publications today carried a statement by the Politburo of the Communist Party of Moldova Central Committee. It expresses concern at positions contained

in a number of documents and speeches at the meeting here on 16 December of the Grand National Assembly which was convened at the initiative of the People's Front of Moldova [NFM] and certain other sociopolitical organizations. On this occasion, the statement notes, the true intentions of the NFM leaders were manifested to a large degree. They declared Moldova to be "occupied Romanian territory." This is at variance with the declaration "on the sovereignty of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]," says the statement.

The present leaders of the NFM are now refusing the Moldovan people the right to its own name, its historic destiny, statehood, and even the right to choose its own future. The final document of the Grand National Assembly states outright that the future "of occupied Romanian territories" can be determined only by the "whole Romanian nation" as the "sole subject" of international law. There were also speeches at the gathering by guests from outside the republic in the spirit of these same encroachments on the sovereignty of Moldova.

We are confronted, the document says, with politicking that is at variance with the Constitution and laws of the Moldova SSR. It is clear to every sane person that such a stance is dangerous and could lead to a further escalation of tension and unforeseen consequences. We perceive the statements about outlawing the party and the offensive attacks on V.I. Lenin as unconstitutional. The involvement of Moldova's representatives in the preparation and signing of a union treaty is rejected, and the adopted document contains an unconcealed threat against those adhering to other views.

Striving, whatever happens, to remove the party from the country's political arena, the statement notes, people are foisting the view on the public that today's communists are responsible for the mass repressions, deformations, and error of the past, and are creating an enemy image in line with well-known and well-tried cliches. In this respect, the leaders are keeping silent about the truth that our party has resolutely condemned Stalinist crimes and has been categoricaly dissociating itself from the theory and practice of totalitarianism. The NFM leaders are deliberately proceeding to whip up political tension, deepening the split in society along world outlook, nationalist, and other lines, and adding grist to the mill of those who are attempting to dismember the republic, the statement emphasizes.

Journalists Deplore Moldova Media Treatment

PM2712143090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Dec 90 Union Edition p 11

["Statement by the USSR Journalists' Union Presidium Board"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Reports from various regions around the country of cases of gross violations of the USSR Law on the Press and Other Mass Media have multiplied recently. Such reports have become especially frequent in the Moldova SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Here, certain forces are placing increasingly serious obstacles in the way of journalists trying to carry out their professional duties.

In regions where the sociopolitical situation is particularly acute—in Kishinev, Dubossary, Komrat and others—representatives from the local press and central publications are denied their legal right to freely receive information and to transmit information they have gathered. Cases of threats to journalists and their families, arrests, and actual physical violence are not uncommon. Within the last few days, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA's correspondent Arkadiy Khantsevich was forced to flee Moldavian territory after publishing a report on the ruin of the editorial team of MOLODEZH MOLDOVY. This newspaper's collective and its editor Aleksey Marchkov were subjected to taunting. Repeated threats directed at USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting correspondent Ivan Petkov ended with his being assaulted and expelled from Moldova.

The leaders of the republic, the prosecutor's office, and the Moldova SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs have not only failed to act to protect the rights and dignity of journalists, but through their inaction have positively encouraged violence. A large-scale campaign to discredit, in particular, correspondents representing central newspapers and agencies in the Moldova SSR was launched in certain local mass media and at various rallies.

Condemning these encroachments on press freedom, an enlarged plenum of the Moldova SSR Journalists' Union adopted an appeal to the government requesting that press workers be guaranteed the necessary conditions for their professional activity. Neither the government nor the Supreme Soviet of Moldova, however, took the required measures.

The persecution of journalists continues. Not all publications allow them to express support for the republic's territorial integrity. The campaign to create an image of the journalist from the central press as an alleged "enemy" of the Moldavian people is acquiring ever greater dimensions.

All these facts and actions represent a gross violation of journalists' rights as enshrined in the USSR Law on the Press and Other Mass Media.

The presidium of the USSR Journalists' Union board utterly condemns the violation of journalists' rights in the Republic of Moldova and demands that those guilty of infringing the rights, honor, and dignity of journalists working in rayon, republic, and central publications and agencies should be made to answer for their actions.

An attack on glasnost is an attack on human rights and democracy.

Comparison to Presidential Decree on Moldova

PM2412123090

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 23 December 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a "USSR President's Decree on Measures To Normalize the Situation in the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]." This has been compared to the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 24 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 94, revealing the following variations:

Page 94, second column, sixth paragraph, only sentence, reads ...SSR on the procedure for its introduction... [replacing "order" with "procedure"];

Same page and column, eighth paragraph, only sentence, reads ...Secret Protocol of 23 August 1939, and... [changing date];

Same page, column, paragraph and sentence, reads ...Northern Bukovina" in terms of its assessment of the... [rewording];

Page 95, first column, first partial paragraph, only sentence, reads ...the Moldova SSR as part of the USSR... [rewording];

Same page and column, sixth full paragraph, reads ...inform the USSR president within 10 days... [replacing "presidium" with "president"]

Odessa Holds Referendum on Free Economic Zone

PM2712141090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 90 Union Edition p 6

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Leonid Kapelyushnyy from Odessa under the "Direct Link" rubric: "Referendum Held in the City. What Now?"]

[Text] The results of the referendum to decide two important questions: whether or not there should be a free economic zone in Odessa, and whether the port plant should be closed, have been added up.

What is the range of opinions? Some 59.6 percent of the adult population—450,341 people—took part in the voting. The vote in favor of a free economic zone was 422,256, or 93.8 percent, with 21,517 against. Some 375,413 voted for the plant's closure, with 63,368 against.

It seems to me that this is the start of the most interesting phase in the emergence of a decision. A decision from a government whose interests the former ministry, now restyled as the "Agrokhim" Association, represent.

As people in the know say, "Agrokhim" is not giving a single inch. Odessa (both the population and the authorities) resorted to a referendum as their last and deciding trump card in their dispute with the department. The port plant is one of the contributing factors to Odessa's ecological disasters.

There is a prospect of 3,000 manual workers at the port losing their jobs. In my opinion, however, it will be a long time before we have unemployment in the direct sense of the word, if people have the desire to work. The closure of the port plant will palpably affect its affiliated enterprises in Tolyatti and Gorlovka.

Caucasus

Yazov Protests Armenian Conscript Decision

LD2812133690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 28 Dec 90

[Text] Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense, has protested to the Armenian legislature regarding its decision that citizens of conscript age from this republic will serve only on its territory. The minister stressed that the acts on this account adopted by the republic are clearly illegal and do not take into consideration common state interests. In reply, Vazgen Sarkisyan, chairman of the Armenian Commission for Issues of Defense and Internal Affairs, said that the decision had already been adopted and the republic's young people should serve at home. The problem is, Sarkisyan pointed out, that the center failed to find a timely compromise solution and is reluctant to make a conciliatory move now, wishing to dictate its will again.

Armenian Presidium Discusses Parties' Property

NC2812101690 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0400 GMT 28 Dec 90

[Text] The Presidium of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet met on 27 December under Babken Araktsyan, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. The meeting discussed the question of the property of the political parties and of public and public-political organizations. It decided to instruct the Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers to present proposals to the Supreme Soviet within one month on regulating property ownership by these organizations. It also decided that until the adoption of a relevant decision by the Supreme Soviet, no property belonging to the political parties and to public and public-political organizations can be confiscated, exchanged, donated, or transferred to state or public organizations.

In line with the Supreme Soviet's temporary standing orders, the Supreme Soviet Presidium decided to take cognizance of the declaration of a group of people's deputies of the Armenian Republic on the formation of a Hanrapetutyun [Republic] deputies' group.

In response to the question raised by the Supreme Soviet's Press Affairs Commission, the Presidium decided to extend state patronage to the KANCH [CALL] children's newspaper and the AGBUYR [FOUNTAIN] and TSITSERNAK [SWALLOW] monthlies. The Council of Ministers was instructed to

assist in the publication of these periodicals and to provide the necessary funds through the Enlightenment Ministry.

The meeting also discussed other issues related to the republic's public and political life.

Armenian Party Central Committee Holds Plenum

PM2612163990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by T. Liloyan: "Reflections Following the 29th Armenian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] The paramount tasks of party organizations in fulfillment of the 29th Armenian Communist Party Congress decisions were examined at a plenum of the party Central Committee held in Yerevan. A report was delivered by S.K. Pogosyan.

Plenum participants noted that the activity of the republic's Communist Party demands a radical perestroyka of party work, its reorientation, and a quest for new approaches, forms, and methods of activity. Henceforth, primary party organizations must be created along territorial lines. Cells will be created under city and rayon party committees, as will Communist groups along vocational and common interest lines, party organizations in electoral districts, party and debating clubs, and party organizers councils.

At the same time, despite current claims that the party must supposedly withdraw completely from participation in economic affairs, Communists intend to actively join the work on stabilizing the republic's economy and transferring it to market conditions.

The plenum elected a new Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and constituted the Central Committee commissions.

Armenian Free Trade Union Chairman Interviewed

NC2712133390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 26 Dec 90

[Interview with Khachik Arutyunyan, Armenian Cooperative Free Trade Union chairman, by unidentified correspondent; date, place not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] Mr. Arutyunyan, your independent trade union organization has been operating now for six months. Our listeners are interested in knowing about the aim of your union and how you are implementing your program.

[Arutyunyan] Our basic aim is to liberate ourselves from the Armenian Trade Unions Council [ATUC] and from the state organs, including from the party's ruling apparatus, and to create a free organization which should manage its relations with the public and political organizations as well as with the state organs, but on contractual principles. Our aims are wider and more comprehensive than could be comprehended, or advanced, by the ATUC. [passage omitted]

There are many problems to which the government's attention must be drawn though for the time being we are not doing this, being well aware that the government still needs breathing space.

[Correspondent] What are your relations with similar organizations in the USSR?

[Arutyunyan] There are 13 such organizations—free and independent trade unions—in the USSR. A Union-wide Confederation of Free Trade Unions [CFTU] has been created which qualitatively differs from the present All-Union Trade Unions Confederation, which used to be the All-Union Trade Unions Council [AUCCTU]. [words indistinct] We freely joined the CFTU. The (?negative) policy pursued by the former AUCCTU—the present All-Union Trade Unions Confederation—has no place in our organization. The CFTU is based on mutual help and equality. Through this confederation we have already established ties with the trade union organizations of Italy, Afghanistan, Hungary, Poland and other foreign countries. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] The Armenian Cooperation Free Trade Union [hamagortsaktsutyun haykakan azat arhmiutyun] has a small administrative staff and therefore it is able to use its funds to allocate 100 percent unemployment benefits [words indistinct]. It uses the right of direct negotiations and signs agreements with sanatoriums and different types of clinical organizations and [word indistinct] satisfies the organizations not by employing the methods of the former centralized system to defend workers' rights but by trying to fulfill the entire contract. So far they have been completely successful in this.

Armenian Enlightenment Minister Views Education

NC2112080790 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 19 Dec 90

[Report by correspondent Anait Gevorgyan—recorded]

[Excerpt] By the decision of the Armenian Republic's legislature, the Enlightenment Ministry [former Education Ministry] was reinstated. Its aim is to speedily reform the school system in fact and not in words, as has been the case. The distortions in the traditional Armenian education system were due to the fact that educational affairs were often run by men who had no knowledge of and were far removed from scholastic affairs. Now I am talking with Minister of Enlightenment Areg Grigoryan. Mr. Grigoryan, let me state from the outset that almost all our present educational curricula and textbooks are outmoded and without value. What is your ministry doing about this?

[Grigoryan] Such a frightening and [words indistinct] problem has never faced Armenian schools and, in particular, the Enlightenment Ministry. We have to revise not just a single book or an issue but all the educational literature—all must be changed. We have already begun to take certain steps in this direction. We are planning to create a department at the new ministry to be known as the Educational-Methodological and Textbooks Department. We hope that this department will be able to organize and conduct that work. [passage omitted]

Autonomous Formations Council Supports NKAO

NC2112204490 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 20 Dec 90

[Excerpts] The correspondent of the Press and Information Service of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation reports from Moscow that the extraordinary session of the coordination council of the association of autonomous formations in the USSR took place on Sunday, 16 December, at the "Serebrenni Bor" resthouse near Moscow. [passage omitted]

The chairman of the association presented the following preliminary agenda for debate: The Union treaty, the draft constitution of Russia, the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast problem, and the "Northern Caucasus" problem of the Shabsugs.

After L. Mirzoyan, the delegate from Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] spoke, the NKAO problem was also included in the agenda.

The session condemned the decision of the Georgian Supreme Soviet to abolish the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast. It also endorsed the following resolution on Artsakh [NKAO]:

The Resolution of the Session of the Coordination Council of the Association of Autonomous Formations:

The session of the coordination council of the association of autonomous formations resolutely condemns the policy pursued by Azerbaijan, the aim of which is to suppress the national liberation struggle of the NKAO's Armenian population by using military force. Armed special purpose military detachments from Azerbaijan have been introduced into the oblast and have already occupied Stepanakert airport. The blockade of the oblast has thus been upgraded into a forcible usurpation. Houses and enterprises are being illegally constructed in Azerbaijani settled areas, thus encouraging the inflow of a work force into the NKAO. The oblast is being resettled by Azerbaijanis, and the Armenian autonomous formation is being Azerbaijanized on a large scale.

Alongside this, the Azerbaijani procuracy is exerting efforts to expel those Armenian refugees from NKAO who have found shelter in the homeland of their forefathers. Because of the Azerbaijani government, the USSR law "on criminal liability for blockading the transportation and other communications means and for other illegal acts preventing their stable and safe operation" is not in force on the territory of NKAO. As a result of this, the economy of the blockaded oblast is sustaining enormous damage.

The Armenian population of NKAO, being deprived of elected organs of authority, lacks legal protection.

The session of the coordination council of the association of autonomous formations is of the opinion that the developments in NKAO result from the racial discrimination practiced in the USSR. It also condemns the Union government, which gave permission to implement a policy to exterminate a people who have chosen the path of democracy.

The association of autonomous formations is of the opinion that the fourth Congress of the USSR people's deputies should ask Azerbaijan to withdraw the armed detachments of the special purpose militia from the oblast, to restore the soviet organs of authority in NKAO, and to provide the opportunity for the Armenian population of NKAO to realize their right to self-determination.

Azerbaijan Releases Statement on NKAO

NC2812155190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Statement from the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs Press Center; date not given]

[Text] The effort to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], the leaders' policy to restore law and order in the NKAO, and the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs and military units' joint measures have further enraged and angered the Armenian nationalist elements. The visits of [word indistinct] from Armenia have had serious effects on the worsening situation. Pogosyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee; Deputy Balayan; and other uninvited people arrived in Stepanakert on 22 December. They tried to provoke interethnic discord by exploiting passions. In fact, they called for the people's mass disobedience and [words indistinct] against the militia workers. The commandant of the state of emergency rayon expelled them from the NKAO.

This behavior has made the armed Armenians and their supporters more ferocious and has encouraged them to commit new crimes. Rakhimov, a resident from Agdzhabedinskiy Rayon, was taken hostage and then killed in Mardakertskiy Rayon on 24 December. Two of the residents of Stepanakert, Grigoryan and Pogosyan, were [word indistinct] by unidentified individuals on 25 December. An investigation has been launched and operational measures are being put into effect. [passage indistinct]

Draft Proceeding 'Normally' in Azerbaijan

LD2612074490 Moscow TASS in English 0725 GMT 26 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow December 26 TASS—"The autumn draft into the Soviet Army is proceeding normally in Azerbaijan," Lieutenant General A. Kasimov, military commissar of Azerbaijan, said at a briefing organised by the AZERINFORM News Agency.

The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspaper, reportinmg about the briefing today, writes that over 50 per cent of draftees were sent to army and fleet units and Interior Ministry troops. Under the Republican Council of Ministers' resolution, over 20 per cent of soldiers will do their military service in Azerbaijan.

The newspaper points out that from now on soldiers from Azerbaijan will not be sent to military units stationed in areas of the country with a harsh climate.

Kasimov said that the flow of young people ready to serve is not drying up.

Gorbachev Envoy Comments on South Ossetia

LD2812110990 Moscow TASS in English 1057 GMT 28 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi December 28 TASS—"The complex situation in Southern Ossetia can only be resolved by measured decisions, coordilated by both sides," Soviet People's Deputy Leonid Gorshkov told TASS.

On Gorbachev's orders, Gorshkov visited Georgia to study the situation around Southern Ossetia.

The abolition by both sides of their unconstitutional decisions would be a constructive start to a dialogue, the deputy believes.

Just such an approach was suggested in the recent address by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the Georgian parliament and the Regional Council of the South Ossetian Autonomous Region.

Commenting on the situation in Tskhinvali and the neighbouring Dzhava region, where the Georgian Supreme Soviet imposed a state of emergency and a curfew, Gorshkov said it was tense.

However, he said that the situation is controlled by Soviet interior troops and republican law-enforcement bodies.

The USSR people's deputy confirmed violations of the stable provision of Southern Ossetia with food supplies, but linked this to inefficient managers, rejecting rumours about a blockade of the autonomous region.

Gamsakhurdia Rejects North Ossetia Protest

LD2712151790 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By Sakartvelo-TASS correspondent Meri Gabriadze]

[Text] Tbilisi December 27 TASS—Georgian parliament president Zviad Gamsakhurdia has rejected a protest by the parliament of the North Ossetian Autonomous Republic at ending the autonomy of the South Ossetian region by the Georgian parliament.

It was reported earlier that the presidium of the North Ossetian parliament had sent a letter of protest to the Georgian parliament after the latter ended the autonomy of the South Ossetian region on December 11.

The letter described the ending of the South Ossetian autonomy as an "unprecedented act, flouting the rights of a small people."

The ZARYA VOSTOKA newspaper, a mouthpiece of the Georgian parliament, today carried a reply by Gamsakhurdia which described the protest by the North Ossetian parliament as "crude interference" in Georgia's internal affairs.

The reply alleges that the decision taken by the Georgian parliament on December 11 "Is legitimate both from the moral-political viewpoint and on legal grounds".

In Gamsakhurdia's opinion, a decision to establish the South Ossetian Autonomous Region was illegally made in 1922, and it was "artifically established on primordial Georgian territory."

Georgian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session

TASS Views New Leadership

LD2712072690 Moscow TASS in English 0719 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS special correspondent Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Tbilisi December 27 TASS—A programme for the economic and social development of Georgia and the state budget for 1991 are the key items on the agenda of the first session of the republican parliament, which resumed work after a week-long break.

Local observers point out that the session rivets close attention because the programme and the budget were drafted by the Georgian Government led by Prime Minister Tengiz Sigua that was sworn into the office recently. These documents will be endorsed by the one-chamber Georgian parliament, the majority of seats in which belongs to representatives of the Round Table-Free Georgia bloc of parties.

This bloc led by Zviad Gamsakhurdiya won the 1990 general elections, the first multi-party elections in Georgia. The success of the political programme of the new leadership that seeks to attain full independence for

Georgia and refused to consider any draft of a new union treaty, will hinge on how effective the social and economic programme of the new leadership will prove to be as the republic is switching to a market economy.

Deputies are expected to adopt today a bill on local government elections, which are scheduled for next March, and a bill on judicial reform and immigration.

Political Forces Not Consolidated

LD2712144190 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 27 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent A. Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi December 27 TASS—The dialogue that seemed to be emerging between the ruling bloc Round Table—Free Georgia Bloc and public organisations not represented in the republican parliament, such as Mkhedrioni and Vsadniki, failed to consolidate the political forces.

The Round-Table accuses Mkhedrioni of destabilising the situation in Georgia. Professor D. Ioseliani, the 64-year-old leader of Vsadniki, told TASS that his organisation worked for a political and national accord to enable the republic to effect progressive transformations in Georgia and prevent ethnic conflicts.

Ioseliani charged the new Georgian leadership with usurping power and suppressing dissent and democracy. He went on a hunger strike in protest against accusations that his associates are destabilising the situation. The action was supported by the parties and movements of the National Congress, an opposition bloc.

The Round-Table refused to participate in settling the situation, accusing representatives of the National Congress of publicly discrediting the Georgian Supreme Soviet. Moreover, women, supporters of the Round-Table, responded to Ioseliani's hunger strike with a counter-fast. They insist that all unofficial armed groups be outlawed and a calm situation be created for the normal operation of parliament.

Works on 1991 Budget

LD2812014190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Dec 90

[Report by correspondent N. Gongadze on the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet proceedings, including recorded remarks by G. Gelantiya, chairman of the Budget Commission of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, and by R. Kh. Kontselidze, chairman of the Consumer Cooperative Societies' Union; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Gongadze] Today the deputies discussed economic matters. Omar Vardzhevashvili, chairman of the State Planning Committee, proposed two possible forecasts of the socioeocnomic development of the Republic of Gerogia for next year: an optimistic one and a pessimistic one. He noted that a refusal to sign the Union treaty would result in the emergence of a number of unforeseen problems, which evidently need to be tackled already.

A number of reforms—proposed in the new draft state budget of the republic of Georgia for the year 1991—will be aimed at improving the economy and stabilizing it. Finance Minister Gura Muvshadze noted that for the first time the drawing up of the state budget took place without a diktat from the center.

[Gelantiya] The expenditures that previously were borne by the Union government were transferred to us—these expenditures were not met for us. Naturally, this at once increased the Republic's deficit by 3 billion rubles. The finance minister proposed to us special emergency measures.

[Gongadze] A vexing question was that of the department bearing non-productive expenditures.

[Kontsedidze] This year we abolished the so-called general building trust and (?Glavuks)—these are two feeding troughs that were eating up cooperative money. Each year they were ending the economic year with tens of millions of rubles in losses. In one year we lost 30 million rubles at once. These are the so-called non-productive expenditures. But for tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow, this is living money that has been returned to us and will be used for developing the material-technical base.

Central Asia

Kazakh Relations With DPRK, ROK Examined

SK2712121390 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 24 Dec 90

[From the "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] The year 1990 is drawing to an end. With the end of 1990 in view, we should note that Soviet-DPRK relations in various aspects have undergone (?some) developments during the year. This is reflected in some of the examples set by the Kazakhstan Republic, the third largest republic in our country in terms of territorial size.

The Kazakhstan Republic is inhabited by (?many ethnic tribes). Among them are about 200,000 Koreans. The republic runs a Korean theater, the only one in the Soviet Union. Also, KORYO ILBO, a Korean language paper, is published there. This newspaper has now grown to become a national daily. The branch of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society in the Kazakh Republic is the only one in our country.

(Askar Buikov), responsible secretary of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society Central Committee, was interviewed by a station reporter on the business of the

Republic's branch office of the Friendship Society. He said: At the end of this year, our branch office will mark the 30th anniversary of its founding. Ten primary organizations were under its control at the beginning and now there are over 50. The offshoot organizations of the branch office have opened their offices in the major cities across the Kazakhstan Republic.

Thanks to the effective activities of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society's activists, the working people in Kazakhstan know much about the DPRK's history and its modern life, as well as the successes the Korean people have achieved in economic and cultural construction.

Our branch organizes an assortment of events, such as Soviet-Korean friendship soirees, lectures and statements on the DPRK, DPRK film shows, and meetings with Soviet specialists who worked in the fraternal country.

An exhibition of the DPRK formative arts held recently in Alma Ata, the capital city of the republic, was successful. Thousands of people saw the objects on display.

Members of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society also celebrated the 45th anniversary of Korea's national liberation throughout the Republic. Marking this meaningful day, a Korean Culture Day was observed in [name indistinct], a district where most of the Korean people in the republic reside.

Soviet soldiers who were part of the Soviet Army that liberated Korea in August 1945 took part in this celebration. Korean stage performers gave performances. There were book exhibitions and exhibitions of children's paintings and artistic photographs.

A delegation of the republic's branch office of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society visited the DPRK. Leading officials of the Friendship Societies from other cities of the republic, such as [names indistinct], were among the members of the delegation.

The recent establishment of Soviet-ROK diplomatic relations provided a stimulus for Kazakhstan and the ROK to forge direct ties.

Of late, many Seoul delegations have visited Alma Ata. One of them donated to the Korean People's Association a number of Korean language text books, photographs, reference books, and literary works.

Even cultural ties are expanding. A recent road show by the Seoul Opera Troupe in Kazakhstan was a great success. The ROK stage performers presented a Korean national opera, "Arirang," to the residents of Alma Ata and other cities in the republic.

A visit to Seoul by Kazakhstan President Nazarbayev was an event of great significance in deepening the working-level cooperation. During his visit, cultural cooperation and film exchanges were discussed between the two sides.

Some major cities in the ROK and Alma Ata, Kazakhstan's capital city, have become sister cities.

Studies of the ROK are also increaseing. For example, a metallurgical factory, [name indistinct], has sent to the ROK a [word indistinct] boat as part of an exchange of [word indistinct]. Business firms in the Kazakhstan are expected to forge such ties.

Kirghiz President Dismisses Osh Oblast Chairman

PM2712161190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Dec 90 Union Edition p 11

[Aleksandr Ryabushkin report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "President Removes Soviet Chairman"]

[Text] Frunze—By decree of the president of the Republic of Kirghizstan, Usen Sydykov has been removed from the post of chairman of Osh Oblast Soviet: Certain tragic events took place there when he was in office.

Neither the various commissions, nor the Central Committee plenum, nor the party congress managed to give a proper assessment of the activity of that party and soviet leader. That was done by the president in his decree: "For an irresponsible attitude toward his official duty, intolerable incompetence in the assessment of events which led to interethnic conflict, and inability to avert the tragic consequences of that conflict, and in view of the public's demand on the need for more effective normalization of the sociopolitical situation in Osh Oblast, in accordance with point 9 of article 114 (3) of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Constitution, Usen Sydykov is relieved of his duties as chairman of Osh Oblast Soviet."

The decree has been received with approval in the republic. Now it is up to the oblast soviet people's deputies, who can reject the president's decision by a two-thirds vote.